

THE
LIFE OF
CHRIST
—
Lange

12,16,22.

From the Library of
Professor Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

B. Sartor
L 275
1872
v. 1

oo

2200.

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR

THE LIFE
OF
Warfield

THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:

A COMPLETE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, CONTENTS,
AND CONNECTION OF

THE GOSPELS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF
J. P. LANGE, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

EDITED, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES,
BY
THE REV. MARCUS DODS, A.M.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: HAMILTON AND CO. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.
MDCCCLXXII.

THE LIFE

OF

*B. Warfield
Sept 5. 1877.*

THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:

A COMPLETE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, CONTENTS,
AND CONNECTION OF

THE GOSPELS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

J. P. LANGE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

VOL. I.

TRANSLATED BY

SOPHIA TAYLOR,

AND

J. E. RYLAND, M.A.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: HAMILTON AND CO. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.

MDCCLXXII.

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY
EDINBURGH AND LONDON

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

	PAGE
EDITOR'S PREFACE,	1
AUTHOR'S PREFACE,	17

FIRST BOOK.

THE INTRODUCTION.

PART I.—THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECT. 1. The Incarnation of God,	27
2. The Personality of Man,	40
3. Organism in the Province of Personal Human Life,	47
4. The Fulness of the Time,	53
5. The Ideality of the Gospel History,	57
6. The Effect of the Ideal History : The Sacred Remembrance,	79

PART II.—THE MORE GENERAL RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF THE LORD JESUS.

SECT. 1. General Survey,	85
2. The New Testament,	86
3. The Old Testament,	88
4. The Theocracy, especially the Christian Church,	90
5. The Spiritual Life of Mankind,	94

PART III.—THE HISTORIC RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF
JESUS.

	PAGE
SECT. 1. The Phenomenon of the Four Gospels,	99
2. The Four Gospels as Records of the Life of Christ,	104

PART IV.—CRITICISM OF THE TESTIMONIES TO THE GOSPEL
HISTORY.

SECT. 1. General Survey,	107
2. The Gospel History as Criticism,	107
3. Antagonistic Criticism in general,	109
4. Antagonistic Criticism in its Subordinate Principles and Aspects,	110
5. Antagonistic Criticism in its Dialectic Dealings,	122
6. Antagonistic Criticism, in its intermixture of Contradictory Assumptions and Opposite Modes of Treatment,	127
7. The Christian Theological Criticism of the Gospel Narratives,	130

PART V.—THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

SECT. 1. The Ecclesiastical Corroboration of the Four Gospels in general,	135
2. The Authenticity of the First Gospel,	142
3. The Authenticity of the Second Gospel,	146
4. The Authenticity of the Third Gospel,	148
5. The Authenticity of the Fourth Gospel,	149

PART VI.—THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

SECT. 1. Various Views of the Origin of the Four Gospels,	177
2. The Origin of the Gospels in general,	181
3. Origin of the Gospels in particular,	186

PART VII.—THE RELATION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS TO THE
GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECT. 1. An Attempt to exhibit the Gospel History in its Unity,	193
2. The Gospel History in the Organic Fourfold Development of its Fulness,	196

SECOND BOOK.

THE HISTORICAL DELINEATION OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.
PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION.

	PAGE
SECT. 1. The Principal Chronological Periods ascertained,	229
2. The Periods of Christ's Life,	238

PART I.—THE HISTORICAL SPHERE OF CHRIST'S LIFE.

SECT. 1. The Relations of Time and Place among which Christ appeared,	239
2. The Scene of Christ's Life, the Promised Land,	246

PART II.—THE HISTORY OF THE BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF THE LORD JESUS.

SECT. 1. Preliminary Remarks,	257
2. The Angel Gabriel,	259
3. Zacharias,	272
4. The Virgin Mary,	276
5. Mary and Elisabeth,	288
6. The Birth of Jesus at Bethlehem,	295
7. The First Homage, or the Shepherds and the Wise Men,	302
8. The Flight into Egypt,	308
9. The Presentation of Jesus in the Temple,	312
10. The Settlement in Nazareth,	316
11. The Fulfilments,	318
12. The Development of Jesus,	320
13. The Family Relations of Jesus,	329

PART III.—THE ANNOUNCEMENT AND CHARACTER OF CHRIST'S PUBLIC MINISTRY.

SECT. 1. Determination of the Dates,	342
2. John the Baptist,	349
3. The Participation of Jesus in the Baptism of John,	355

	PAGE
SECT. 4. The Manifestation of the Messiah to the People of Israel,	357
5. The God-man,	364
6. The Tempter,	369
7. The Spiritual Rest and Spiritual Labour of Christ in the Wilderness—the Temptation,	376
8. The Plan of Jesus,	393
9. The Miracles of Jesus,	413
10. The Teachings of Christ, especially the Parables,	471
11. The Kingdom of God,	483

ERRATA FOR VOL. I.

Page 49, line 10, and page 64, line 18, *for* ‘solution,’ *read* ‘watchword.’
Page 74, line 3 from foot, *for* ‘living myths,’ *read* ‘living beings.’
Page 167, line 17, *for* ‘lyric,’ *read* ‘mosaic.’

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THE work of Dr Lange, translated in the accompanying volumes, holds among books the honourable position of being the most complete Life of our Lord. There are other works which more thoroughly investigate the authenticity of the Gospel records, some which more satisfactorily discuss the chronological difficulties involved in this most important of histories, and some which present a more formal and elaborate exegetical treatment of the sources ; but there is no single work in which all these branches are so fully attended to, or in which so much matter bearing on the main subject is brought together, or in which so many points are elucidated. The immediate object of this comprehensive and masterly work, was to refute those views of the life of our Lord which had been propagated by Negative Criticism, and to substitute that authentic and consistent history which a truly scientific and enlightened criticism educes from the Gospels. It is now several years since the original work appeared in Germany, but the date of its first appearance will be reckoned a disadvantage only by those who are unacquainted with the recent history of theological literature. No work has in this interval appeared which has superseded, or can be said even to compete with this. So that, while it is no doubt a pity that the English-reading public should not have had access to this work long ago, we have now the comfort of receiving a book whose merits have been tested, and which claims our attention not in the doubtful tones of a stripling, but with the authoritative accent of one that has attained his majority.

A cursory notice of the leading works which have more recently been added to this department of literature, may serve both to aid younger students in selecting what may suit their tastes or intentions, and to show that the present work is by no means out of date. And, first of all, there has been issued a new edition (1854) of the work of Dr Karl Hase (*Das Leben Jesu*), originally published in 1829. This book is intended mainly for an academical text-book;

and as such its merits are willingly acknowledged. In less than 250 pages this compact volume exhibits, one may say, all the opinions and literature connected with the life of our Lord. As an index to, or compendium of, the whole contents of this department of literature, nothing more can reasonably be desired. This must, of course, be taken with that exception which we have to attach to the majority of German works, in consideration of their ignorance of our own literature. This is manifest in Dr Hase's manual, and sometimes even absurdly so. But, with this exception, there is given in this volume a complete view of all the opinions which have been entertained regarding the ideas and incidents of the life of our Lord, accompanied by copious references to the writings where these opinions are maintained. The style is dense and clear, and the arrangement perspicuous, so that the use of the volume as a text-book is easy. Unfortunately, the author's own opinions are not always such as can be adopted, but must rather be added as one more variety to the mass of opinions he presents to our view. His critical judgments, often useful in demolishing the profanities of the vulgar Rationalism, are themselves tainted with the meagre theology of Schleiermacher and De Wette. He denies the divinity of Christ, while he considers Him a sinless, perfect man, in whom humanity culminates and is glorified, and by whose doctrine and life the new community is founded. He at once and distinctly enounces his position, saying (p. 15), 'Since the divine can reveal itself in humanity only as veritable human, the perfect image of God only as the religious archetype of man, the life of Jesus must be considered as simple human life; and without giving free and constant play to the human development, we cannot speak of a history of Jesus.' To find such a view held by a man of accomplished critical ability, of vigorous and clear intellect, and great research, is not so surprising as to find it held by one who professes, as Dr Hase does, to take John's Gospel as the most faithful representation of our Lord.

Another work of importance is that of Heinrich Ewald (*Geschichte Christus' und seiner Zeit*, 1st ed. 1854, and 2d, 1857). This forms the fifth volume of the author's History of the Hebrew People, and contains very thorough and instructive discussions of the historical circumstances of the life of Christ. The political condition of the Jews, their internal factions and their relations to the Gentile world, their religious and moral declension, are exhibited with much ability and learning; and the significance of the appearance of our Lord as a Jew in the time and place He did, is brought out with great acuteness and originality. But here again the whole work is

blighted by the defective view of our Lord's person, and the unjustifiable treatment of the documentary sources, which have spoiled so much of German criticism. Ewald views Jesus as the fulfilment of the Old Testament,—as the final, highest, fullest, clearest revelation of God,—as the true Messiah, who satisfies all right longing for God and for deliverance from the curse,—as the eternal King of the kingdom of God. But with all this, and while he depicts our Lord's person and work, in its love, activity, and majesty, with a beauty that is not often met with, there is but one nature granted to this perfect Person, and that nature is human. He is not a man such as the rest of us, not one of the million, but the Sent of God, the Word of God, even the Son of God, prepared for through the ages gone by, attended throughout His life by the power of God, endowed with the highest gifts and imbued with the Spirit of God, so that He speaks out of God and works the works of God ;—but still He on whom all this is conferred, through whom God wholly reveals and communicates Himself, and on whom the world in its helplessness hangs, is but a man. In the concluding chapter of the volume (p. 498) occurs the distinct utterance that so many former pages have seemed to contradict :—‘ Even the highest divine power, when it wraps itself in a mortal body and appears in a determinate time, finds its limits in this body and this time ; and never did Jesus, as the Son and the Word of God, confound Himself, or arrogantly make Himself equal, with the Father and God.’ Still, this volume is one from which a great deal may be gained. It abounds in noble, elevating thoughts, most eloquently expressed ; in sudden gleams into new regions, which fire the soul. The delicate and profound spiritual insight of the author, his sense of many, if not of all, the necessities of a sinful race, enable him to apprehend and depict with wonderful power the perfect humanity of our Lord, and in part the fulfilment of His mission.

A work of very different character appeared at Basle in 1858 from the pen of Professor C. J. Rigggenbach. (*Vorlesungen über das Leben des Herrn Jesu.*) These Lectures profess to be popular, and aim throughout at the accurate apprehension of the subject on the part of the hearer, rather than at learned or ostentatious disquisition on the speaker's part. He discards much of the conventional scientific terminology, as being nothing better than Greek and Latin fig-leaves to hide the nakedness of our knowledge. Through his own veil of popular address, however, it is easy to discern the thews and sinew of a vigorous intellect, and the careful and instructed movement of one who knows and has thoroughly investigated the numerous difficulties of his path. Here and there,

too, there is inserted an excursus which enters with greater minuteness into some topic which calls for fuller discussion. In these, the author's strength and culture are more nakedly revealed, and valuable contributions made to the solution of the questions at issue. The characteristics which this work displays, as a whole, are accuracy, taste and judgment, impartiality, reverence and spiritual discernment, and an easy, graceful, and lucid style. It is very much what there is great need of among ourselves,—a volume which should exhibit in a popular form, and in a well-arranged narrative, the results of the immense amount of labour that has recently been spent upon the Gospels.

Such a want can scarcely be said to be supplied by Bishop Elliecott's *Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ* (Hulsean Lectures for 1859);¹ though he too proposed to combine 'a popular mode of treating the question under consideration, and accuracy both in outline and detail.' The actual combination is, we fear, too mechanical. A work which is so loaded with footnotes is in great danger of being unpopular. The narrative flows along the top of the page easily enough, but one is always forgetting, and ignoring its intrinsic value, and counting it merely as a row of pegs to hang the notes upon. The notes themselves are a valuable digest of all the important questions which are started by this subject, and present a selection of authorities which renders the volume an admirable guide to the student. In judging of this work, too, we must bear in mind that, until its publication, the English reader had access to no similar volume, except that of Neander. Probably, however, this book is scarcely of the same value, though it may be to many of as much interest, as those admirable commentaries by which the author has won himself so much grateful and affectionate regard, and by which he has done so much to maintain among us a respect for sound theology and Christian scholarship.

And lastly, there is the unhappy work of M. Ernest Renan (*Vie de Jésus*, 1863), the most deplorable literary mistake of this century. It reveals a lamentable ignorance on the part of the French public, that a book, which in Germany would have been out of date twenty years ago, should now create so much excited interest. But, as we have ourselves been recently taught in this country, it is sometimes the case, that a man makes use of a popular style to introduce as novelties, statements that have been slain and buried among scholars, or to start afresh doubts that belong to a past generation.

¹ The work of Dr Hanna promises well in this direction, but 'finis coronat opus.' And, so far as it goes, M. de Pressensé's '*Le Rédempteur*' is a good popular exhibition of the leading features of the life of our Lord.

This appeal to the people, which has been so much practised of late, and which can be made with every appearance of earnestness and honesty, is not always quite above suspicion. When one brings before the public questions which have exercised the ability of professional theologians, might it not be expected that the public should be made aware that these questions are not now for the first time broached, that many critics of learning and skill have spent much labour on their solution, and that the answer now propounded or insinuated is not the only answer that can be or has been given? This, however, is by no means always attended to. An old difficulty is produced as if now for the first time discovered, and set forward as that which must quite alter the old ways of thinking, and shake us out of our established beliefs; whereas it has been considered all along, and either satisfactorily answered among scientific theologians, or else reserved for possible solution when the branch of inquiry which might throw light upon it has been more fully pursued. And in no work more than in that of M. Renan, is the labour of earnest and skilful critics ignored. Theories which have been abandoned are here used as established, and statements hazarded which no one can be asked to accept who understands what has been *proved* about the Gospels. If this ignorance be real, then it is culpable in one who undertakes with a very unseemly confidence to instruct an erring Christendom; if assumed, then it is nothing short of the most unworthy insolence towards those who have laboured in the same field as himself.

The Christ whom M. Renan depicts, is not the perfect man of Hase, still less the perfect revelation of God that Ewald delights to invest with whatsoever things are pure and lovely, but a good-hearted Galilean peasant, who gradually degenerates into an impostor and gloomy revolutionist. The 'Rabbi *delicieux*' becomes, by some unaccountable transformation of character, a morbid, disappointed fanatic when M. Renan but waves over him his magic wand. The miracles performed by him have been enormously exaggerated, and cures which a physician of our advanced age could very simply have accomplished were then looked upon as divine works. At first, Jesus was unwilling to appear as a thaumaturge; but he found that there was but the alternative, either to satisfy the foolish expectations of the people, or to renounce his mission. He therefore prudently and honourably (M. Renan thinks) yielded to his friends, and entered on a course of mild and beneficent deception. It apparently forms no part of the author's plan to show how this picture is reconcilable with the statements of the Gospels. The references to the narratives of the Evangelists, which are to be found

on almost every page, are quite useless, being often detached from their immediate connection, and frequently grossly misapplied. So that his able reviewer, M. de Pressensé, has good cause to say : 'A chaque pas on a des preuves nouvelles de l'aisance incroyable avec laquelle M. Renan traite les documents et de l'absence de toute méthode rigoureuse dans son livre' (*L'Ecole Critique*, p. 20.) His occasional references to other and more recondite sources, and his comparison of our Lord to Cakya-Mouni, may be intended to show how impossible it is for plain people to form a correct estimate of one who lived so long ago, and under such foreign influences, and to beget the feeling that there may have been hid, among the centuries and millions of the Eastern world, reformers as zealous and philosophers as divinely inspired as Jesus ; but we think it likely that most readers will find a truthfulness in the simple portrait of the Evangelists, which is not to be found in M. Renan's erudite pages, and will refuse to abandon their belief in Him whom the Evangelists represent, even though they have not read the Vedas or the Talmud at first hand.

The work of M. Renan is open to three fatal objections. It has, first of all, no historical basis. He refuses to accept the only documents from which a Life of Jesus can be derived, or he has so used them as manifestly to annul their value as historical witnesses. If in one sentence he admits their truthfulness, in the next he contradicts them. The person whom he exhibits to his readers, is not the Jesus of the Gospels. He has first formed his idea of a character, and then has selected from the original sources whatever might seem to corroborate this idea, leaving altogether out of account, and without any reason assigned for the omission, whatever contradicts his idea. Now, to say nothing of the folly of so unscientific a treatment of any historical documents, or of the utter worthlessness of whatever may be produced by such a method, every one sees that the arbitrary criticism of the author has laid him open to criticism of a like kind. If it is but a matter of private judgment what we are to receive from the Gospels, and what to reject, then why is M. Renan to become my teacher ? He says, that in the relation of such and such an event or discourse, Luke is to be preferred ; Ewald and Hase both come forward with denial, and assure us that, beyond all contradiction, John is to be preferred. To this no reply is possible on the part of M. Renan. He has started without principle, and has no principle to fall back upon. He has arbitrarily judged the Evangelists, and arbitrarily must himself be judged.

Then, secondly, not only is the character which he depicts base-

less so far as historical evidence goes, but it is inconsistent with itself, and therefore impossible. The author's method is bad, his result is worse. He has invented a historical character, and his invention does not even meet the requirements of poetry. He has been much praised as an artist; but he lacks the highest quality of an artist, truthfulness of conception. With unusual power of representation, with a cultivated faculty for reproducing past events and transporting his readers to scenes far distant, he fails in comprehension. His work is fragmentary, not a whole. Several of its parts lack nothing in artistic beauty and power; but when we endeavour to put them together, we find that they have no affinity. All that this writer lacked in order to produce a work of incalculable influence and profit to the world, was the fellowship with his subject which would have given him the meaning and place of each event in the life, by enabling him to conceive the purpose and spirit of the whole. But starting with his own low conception, he has been forced to interpret certain acts of our Lord by causes wholly insufficient, and to exhibit a growth of character and progress of incident which a second-rate novelist would be ashamed of. He has represented the most pious of men as a deceiver, the most simple as ambitious, the most narrow and prejudice-fettered as the enlightener of all nations. No real character combines such contradictions; no dramatist who values his reputation represents his characters as passing through any such unnatural transitions. M. Renan's book is one more proof, that we must either raise Jesus much above the level of a mere pious, pure man, or sink Him much below it.

Then, thirdly, this person depicted by M. Renan is unfit to serve the required purpose. This '*Vie de Jésus*' is the first book of a proposed '*Histoire des Origines du Christianisme*.' And it must occur to most readers that this figure is quite an inadequate origin of Christianity. Granting that the portrait here given us were historically correct, that the conception were consistent and truthful, yet the person represented is not that person who stands at the birth of Christianity. This is not He to whom all the ages have been looking back, and whose image all Christians have borne in their hearts. This is not the morning star. Does M. Renan answer, that it is a mistake to which we have been looking back? Still it is this mistake which has made us Christians, and not the Christ of M. Renan. We descend with him to his own level, and altogether deny that the person exhibited in his volume is He who has caused and maintained our religion. What claim has this Galilean peasant on us? What has he done for us, that for his sake we should endure all hardness, taking up our cross daily and following him?

He has lived well, he has spoken well ; but with how many besides must he share our respect ? Is it because this man has lived, that through all these centuries men have humbled themselves ? Is it this man they have been clothing in clothing the naked—this man whom they have seen represented in all that needs consolation, sympathy, and help ? Is it the remembrance of this man that has made life a ministry, and death a triumph ? This man makes no claim on us—does not know us, and we will not own him. This person is not he who has called forth the trust of a world ; this work is not that on which sinners, in the hour of their clearest vision of God, have rejoiced to rest ; this character is not that which has moulded all that has been best on our earth, and all that has shone bright in its darkest places. If this be the founder of Christianity, then we must look for Christians among the sceptical and the Deists, among the careless and profane ; and we must call that better religion which men (at their own instance, forsooth) have developed, and which has been the real belief and hope of Christendom, by some other name. If this be the founder of Christianity, and if Christianity be the right belief, then all religion must cease from the earth ; for not only is this character unfit to sustain Christianity, but it is unfit to sustain any religion ; it wants the *bond*.

Before passing from this brief account of the very interesting literature of the life of our Lord, there should be mentioned two works, which, though they do not undertake a consideration of the whole subject, are yet so eminently serviceable in their special departments as to deserve careful study. One of these is the work of Lichtenstein on the Chronology of the Gospel Narrative (*Lebensgeschichte des Herrn Jesu Christi in chronologischer Uebersicht*. Erlangen, 1856). This author has the great advantage of writing after Wieseler ; and, as the complement and corrective of the investigations of that very sagacious chronologist, his work does admirable service. With a mind well adapted for such research, scholarly, well-balanced, impartial, and clear, he has provided what is perhaps, on the whole, the safest chronological guide through the perplexing intricacies of this history. The other work is *The Life of our Lord upon the Earth, in its Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Relations*, by the Rev. Samuel J. Andrews. (Lond. 1863.) In this unassuming volume the various opinions of the best authorities are brought together, sifted, arranged, compared, and weighed; while the author's own opinion, though never asserted with arrogance or parade, is always worthy of consideration. Indeed, this work is indispensable to any one who intends a thorough study of the subject, but yet has not access to the authorities them-

selves, or has not leisure to use them. And so extensive is the literature of the mere external aspects of this Life, that it will still be but a few who can dispense with such a handbook as this. The accuracy of his references, and impartiality of his citations, as well as the fairness and candour of his own judgments, inspire us with confidence in the author.

Such being, so far as we know, a fair statement of what has transpired since the original publication of the work of Dr Lange, and which might be thought to diminish its value, it is obvious that this work has neither been superseded nor found a rival. And, regarding these volumes herewith issued, it is not too much courtesy to ask from the reader that he judge considerately a work which enters into all the difficulties of so wide and delicate a subject, and which emerges, as this does, from the turmoil of German opinion. There are but few occasions on which even this consideration will be required, and we believe that every candid reader will instinctively and spontaneously give it. For the genius of the author and the unmistakable direction of his theology, his love of truth and openness to conviction, disarm criticism, and turn assailants into apologists, if not into partisans. The author was himself well aware of the difficult nature of the task he had undertaken, and at the appearance of the second volume of his work he made a statement which it is proper should be before the reader:—‘The author has had to enter into difficulties which have been left more or less unsolved in theological discussions. The result of his labours on these subjects he commits with confidence to the liberal and evangelical theologians of the present and the future. They who, confusing the general Church point of view with their own respective assumptions, formed as they are within the Church, meet with aught that seems strange to them in the discussion of single points, will find it a reasonable request, that they would, before passing a decided judgment, not only carefully weigh the reasons given by the author, but also compare his view with the views prevailing among Church theologians on the points in question. How very easily erroneous judgments may be precipitately formed, has often been proved. Before the bar of truth such judgments would be unimportant but though I do not, for this reason, fear them on my own account, I would yet, as far as possible, prevent others forming them, from an apprehension of the curse resting upon all error. This cannot, however, apply to those whom a gloomy fanaticism induces to be always hunting for suspicious passages. They will find much which may lie open to the attacks of their uncalled-for decisions.’

There are some branches of Theology which, as the cautious

Nitzsch says, ‘are yet young and tender’—some questions on which the Church has not pronounced ; and on these the author will not be found to hold invariably the same views which are currently received in this country. There is, *e.g.*, the old question whether Christ would have come in the flesh, if Adam had not sinned ? whether Christ is necessary for the perfection as well as for the redemption of humanity ? This is a question which, so far as the voice of the Church goes, may be answered either affirmatively or negatively. It is a question which must be answered not so much by direct statements of Scripture, as by its connection with other and already answered questions. It would probably have been answered in the negative by the majority of our own theologians, and by the systematic divines of the seventeenth century. But the vast majority of German theologians have declared for the affirmative ; Müller and Thomasius being almost solitary exceptions. It may be significant, that the theologians who have habitually treated the doctrines of grace, and from them reasoned to the person of Christ, have maintained the negative to this question; while those who have made the person of Christ their first and main study, and only from it inferred the other doctrines, have adopted the affirmative. However, it will not be thought surprising that, in the following volumes, considerable use should be made of the position, that apart from sin and the purpose of redemption, Christ would have come in the flesh—that the incarnation was required not only for the restoration but for the completion of humanity. This is not the place to urge what may be said on one side or other of the question, nor even to decide whether the question do not lie in a province altogether beyond Theology, and into which only incautious and immoderate speculation intrudes. This is not the place to show how the affirmative answer admits of a somewhat attractive application to some of the cardinal doctrines of our faith, and how many probabilities range themselves in its support ; nor, on the other hand, to show that it seems to bring the nature of God unduly near to that of man (thus bordering dangerously on Pantheism), and to make light of that separation between the divine and human which has been brought about by sin. But it seems necessary, in one word, to warn the inexperienced reader, that if the incarnation of Christ were from the first and by the very idea of humanity required, then the humiliation of Christ becomes a different and less grievous humiliation than we are wont to consider it, and the aspect of Christ’s life upon earth in many points altered.

But besides these questions, about which there may be private opinions, and which must be decided rather by the general tone of

Scripture than by its express statements, rather by their results and bearings upon other doctrines than by their own contents, there are dogmas which it is quite easy to state abstractly, but most difficult to apply to actual cases. It is one thing to state dogmatically the constitution of Christ's person, another to carry this dogma through the life of Christ, and exhibit the two natures in harmonious exercise. It is one thing to state that the two natures ever concur to the same resulting act, another to single out one particular act and exhibit this concurrence. Now this seems to be the great problem which those have to face who undertake a rigorous treatment of the Gospel history. It has been too much the custom of writers on the life of Christ to satisfy themselves with an occasional statement of the doctrine of His divinity, without attempting to keep the reader face to face with this doctrine throughout the whole history. In Germany the difficulty of exhibiting the perfect divinity of Christ throughout His earthly life has been so strongly felt, that their writers on Christology have revived an old and detrimental heresy, which delivers us from the necessity of attempting to exhibit full and perfect divinity in this period of our Lord's existence. It is believed by many of their theologians¹ that the Logos, in becoming incarnate, divested Himself of some of His attributes—that the 'emptying' Himself of which we read in the Apostle Paul, means a self-examination whereby the divinity became as it were asleep in the person of Christ, or absent, or voluntarily incompetent for divine action,—whereby at least He really emptied Himself of the fulness of divine power. This doctrine is but the inevitable result of keeping in the background the divinity of Christ's person. If the divinity be but the necessary substratum of His person, be an inoperative constituent of His person, then the actual presence of real, complete, active divinity becomes awkward and undesirable. But if the person of our Lord be really and indissolubly of two natures ; if in each moment of His earthly life there is present the divine as well as the human nature ; if in each act or word of His the divine and human natures are concurrent,—then it must be the task of one who undertakes a life of this person to exhibit the two natures, and not either in separation from the other. Doubtless there is a skill in the Evangelists which no uninspired pen will ever rival, and by which we are made to feel the presence of the divine nature throughout the human life ; yet surely it is our duty to endeavour, in our expositions and developments of these inspired records, to maintain

¹ We are surprised to find that Alford (on Heb. i. 4) gives the weight of his name to a doctrine which, to say the least of it, seems plainly enough condemned by the Athanasian Creed.

the impression which their immediate perusal produces. If they often bring out to view the divinity of our Lord, where also the very feebleness of humanity is conspicuous; if, when they show us a weary and foot-sore wanderer seated by the well in the heat of the day, they make us feel a reverential awe for that weakness, inasmuch as it is the humiliation of a divine person; if, when they show us the man hanging on the cross, faint for thirst, they show us also the divine power to speak forgiveness with His latest breath to the dying sinner by His side; if, when we see human weakness at its depth sinking in death, we hear also the divine proclamation of a willing sacrifice, the ‘It is finished’ of one whose life no man can take away;—then a life of Christ is just in so far imperfect as it effaces from our minds this distinct impression of divinity and humanity acting in the one person.

Now it need not be denied, that in these volumes there is room for improvement in respect of this leading problem. The author holds most distinctly and decidedly the doctrine of our Lord’s divinity,—of His personal pre-existence as God the Son. If this doctrine is not always in view where we might expect it, then this is not by any means because the author would thus insinuate that the person contemplated is merely human. There is not the smallest ground for suspicion of this; we almost feel that it is doing him a wrong to make this statement. Yet we are not quite sure that all readers will take up that idea of the Person which the author would desire. We think that he has sometimes ascribed to the humanity what can only be ascribed to divinity. We think that there is visible throughout the work an undue desire to attribute as much as possible to the human faculty of our Lord. Now, of course, it is not at all easy to say what is and what is not competent to human nature. We do not know, except by its exhibition in Christ, what that nature is capable of. It has only once been seen in perfect development and exercise, and that is in the case in question. So that it is often difficult to make any valid objection to one who asserts of this or that action in the life of our Lord, that it is simply human. It may be an action which demanded far more than ordinary human faculty, and yet may possibly be within the range of perfect human faculty. It is impossible to produce from human history any similar exercise of power or wisdom; and yet this being the culminating point of human history, we expect here to find unrivalled human action. In short, we are to beware of confounding perfect humanity with divinity, and, in the life of Christ, of ascribing to His divine power what ought to be attributed to His perfect human nature. But there is no necessity that we should pronounce

upon every action whether it be competent to human nature or no. We are not to expect to go through the life of Christ, saying, This His humanity does, and this again His divinity. Both human and divine acts are competent to this person ; and though now it is a human and again a divine act which He does, though now He forgives sin and again sleeps through weariness, His humanity and divinity are alike and together engaged in each. But sometimes it is apparent that such and such an act of His is divine, and there we can say, This person is not merely human ; and sometimes it is apparent that the action is human, and there we can say, This person is not merely divine.

So that there are two positions which must regulate our conception of any single action of this life. First, Every act in the life of Christ is a divine as well as a human act. The divine nature of Christ is not only present, as a spectator or sleeping partner of the human, but is energetic in every act. Especially is this true of some of those actions which are most conspicuously, and to some beholders exclusively, human. It is true of His dying. This is an act, it is shortly said, which God cannot perform. But what was this dying? It was the separation of the human body and soul of our Lord. And this God the Son did perform. He offered Himself through the Spirit. The divine nature did not die ; but the dying here in question was the act of a divine person, was an act by, in, and on a divine person. If not, then this dying was little to us. If there was here a retirement of divinity that this human act might be performed; if there was a self-depotentiation of the Logos that men might work their will with the humanity, then this was not the sacrifice sufficient for our atonement. We must lay aside our natural expectation, that wherever God is, the utterance of His presence will be loud, His glory manifest, His acts appalling and stupendous. We must learn to see God stooping to lift the little children, veiling His glory in the compassionate and wistful look of a brother, that the diseased might come to the touch of His hand, and the sinner listen to His word of forgiveness ; leaving the place of His glory empty, that He might follow and recover the abandoned ; becoming flesh, that He might taste death for every man.

On the one hand, the humanity of Christ must not be regarded as impersonal, as a thing used by God, as a collection of passive, unwilling faculties, but as fully equipped humanity,—not indeed existing as a person outside of the divinity, but neither interrupted by the divinity in the free exercise of any human faculty, nor prevented in any human weakness. And, on the other hand, the divinity must be regarded as complete and perfect divinity, not

divested of any divine power by its union with the human nature, not at the incarnation laying aside nor emptying itself of any of those divine attributes which it was the very purpose of the incarnation to manifest and glorify, not in respect of any divine attribute ‘ceasing to be what He previously was’ by becoming what He previously was not.

The second position is this: every divine operation in the life of Christ was immediately the operation of the Spirit. This is a simple corollary from the established theological truth, that every operation of God on things external is through the Spirit. Whatever, then, the divinity of Christ performed after His human birth, was the result of the sending forth of the Spirit from the Son dwelling in the person of our Lord. There is not merely an influence of the Holy Ghost on Jesus, a mere man, so that the miracles are performed in no sense by the divine nature in Christ, but by powers conferred from without. There is the Holy Ghost in His fulness residing *in this Person*, so that without this person there proceeds no power from divinity to any created thing. And it is just this which distinguishes the miracles of Christ from the miracles of a mere man; the latter being performed by virtue of a divine power which only for the time is communicated to the person, the former being the forth-putting of a power of which this Person is the proper residence. And yet the miracles are given to Him by the Father to do, and are in a sense ‘not His own works.’ For as in His whole mission the Son is the Sent of the Father fulfilling His will, so the works which He does are the Father’s works. And this both because He Himself is the Father’s commissioner on earth, and because without the Father the Spirit, by whose working this commission is discharged, is not given. So that the distinctive agency by which the miracles of our Lord were wrought was the incarnate Person dwelling in union with the Father, and possessing the fulness of the Spirit; was not the divinity of Christ without the Spirit, but was not the Spirit without the divinity.

We are therefore under no necessity to inquire (as the author unduly does) whether or no the miracles may not be brought a little nearer human nature. They are no doubt performed *through* the human nature, but so is every divine act in the life of our Lord. We see the human nature active in all its faculties throughout the miracle; but we are not on that account to suppose that the miracle is explicable on human principles and laws, for *all* the divine acts of Christ are human acts also,—the acts of a Person in whom the Spirit of God is harmoniously co-operating with and possessing every human faculty. That we see ordinary and human means

made use of in some of the miracles ; that we see inquiry as to the nature of the disease, and delay in its cure ; that we see many traces of human procedure ; that we see *humanity doing its utmost* in these miracles ;—all this is assuredly no reason for our seeking to ascribe to the human nature more than the most ascertained science would warrant, because in the whole life of Christ we are prepared to see the highest manifestations of divinity in juxtaposition with ordinary human action. To say that, in this case or that, the divine nature of our Lord is not manifestly exercised in distinction from the human, is only to say that here you have an instance of what must be everywhere expected in His life. And when a demand is made or a longing betrayed, that in the miracles the divine nature be exhibited without the intervention of the Spirit ; or when, as a result or accompaniment of this, there is manifested a tendency to ascribe as much as possible to the human nature influenced by the Spirit, without the ascription of this very influence of the Spirit to the divine nature resident in Christ,—then there is not only a misconception of miracle, but a misconception of the Person of our Lord.

It has been thought better to make these general statements by way of preface, than to adopt the somewhat invidious expedient of interrupting the course of the author's argument by interjectional comments. On the one hand, we have considered it unjust to an author to use for the refutation of his views the very pages which were intended to advance them ; and, on the other hand, we have presumed that it would not be very interesting to the public to be informed of every instance in which the private opinion of the editor might differ from that of the author. This applies especially to the section on Miracles. No attempt has been made to put the reader in possession of a theory of miracles which might be thought more adequately to satisfy the requirements of the Gospel narratives. This would evidently have required a much larger space, and much stronger claims on the attention of the reader, than our connection with this work would allow us to assume. Where, however, any point seemed to admit of being treated in the narrow limits of a foot-note, we have used some liberty with the author, always in a respectful spirit, though not always finding room for the forms of polite deference ; and where an opinion opposed to the author's seems to have been treated with less consideration than it merits, either intrinsically or by reason of the consideration due to its advocates, we have not scrupled to produce and support such opinion. But throughout we have felt this business of annotating a delicate one, and have not altogether regretted that the time allotted for the task prevented a more frequent and substantial interference

with the writings of one whose statements it is almost equally difficult to supplement and unsafe to contradict. Care has been taken to render the work as available as possible to the English reader. In the case of those books referred to by the author, which have been translated into our own language, the references have been made to the translations. Where the works have not been translated, the German titles have been left as in the original, for distinction's sake. A full and carefully compiled index will be given in the last volume.

We sincerely wish that some abler, steadier hand could have been employed to launch these volumes, for now more than ever do we understand the grandeur of their subject and the paramount importance of its accurate apprehension ; but we trust that those who most distinctly and painfully see the defects of our share in the work, will not the less earnestly desire and pray that it may diffuse juster conceptions of the Person and work of our Redeemer, and may beget an interest in His earthly life which may be the beginning of eternal fellowship with Him in the life everlasting ; that those even who come but to touch the hem of His garment, to observe His movements, to speculate on His miracles, to consider the development of His character, to retire for a little from the glare and hurry of our day into the fresh and calm morning when the world awoke at the touch of its Lord,—that even these may be drawn to follow Him, and may pass from the first confession of Peter, ‘Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,’ to the last, ‘Lord, Thou knowest all things ; Thou knowest that I love Thee.’

THE EDITOR.

EDINBURGH, *March 1864.*

P R E F A C E.

I HAVE for many years cherished a secret inclination to attempt a delineation of the life of Jesus. It is to my present official situation, however, that I am indebted for leisure and opportunity to realize this idea. I think it necessary to state this, for the sake of preventing erroneous constructions, and especially such as might attribute the polemics of my work rather to my external relations than to my internal convictions.

The fact that multitudinous works on the life of Jesus have followed each other in a succession which at present seems endless, has not availed to turn me from my purpose. The conviction that I also am called upon to promote the knowledge of this great subject, is accompanied by a good conscience, and forbids all false and conventional apologies, and only allows me to offer them for my defective fulfilment of a work entrusted to me. It seems to me, moreover, that there can be no reason for any uneasiness at the appearance of so many works on the life of Jesus. The fact that, even by professional and official theologians, direct and repeated insult has of late been done to the Gospel history, the pride and boast of Christendom, and that the attempt has been made to form this insulting theology into a distinct school, which shall institute a new treatment of the Gospels, has evoked this phenomenon. The various 'Lives of Jesus' of the better sort form a new theological consecration, which we may hope is not yet concluded. The old custom, however, of connecting a consecration with a fair, applies in this case also ; and we must reconcile ourselves to the connection of this consecration with the motley fair of a mass of works on the life of Jesus, furnished in answer to external motives.

The plan which is to guide the work begun in this volume bears reference to the foundation, the peculiar characteristics, and the development of the evangelical history, and hence to its root, its stem, and its branches.

With respect to the foundation of the Gospel history, the attempt has been made, in the present Book, to furnish a clear representation of two of its essential relations : its relation, on the one hand, to the ideal and its multiform phenomena, and on the other, to criticism.

In the second Book follows a continuous and synoptic exhibition of the life of Jesus. In this I hope to give distinct prominence to the chief particulars of the articulation by which the four Gospels are united into one actual history.

In the third and last Book, I propose to sketch the life of Jesus in its broader features, according to that development of its infinite richness which is presented by the peculiar views of each separate Gospel.

In this work, the assumption (which is still too widely prevalent) that the essential Gospel history is injured, and has become a spoilt joint history, will be emphatically opposed. The prejudice, that the four accounts are the source of a want of unity, will be met by the proof that they rather exhibit the richness of this unity. If the Lord give me health and strength, the execution of the work shall not be delayed.

The relation of the Gospel history to that criticism which is antagonistic to it, is already happily and ecclesiastically decided. It is, however, the task of Theology to explain the same scientifically; and the author will feel happy if he shall in any wise have contributed to its accomplishment. It may here, however, be once for all remarked, that too sharp a distinction cannot be made between criticism in a Christian sense, and the Antichristian nuisance which now assumes that name. Christianity is, in its absolute trustworthiness and infinite depth of spiritual light and vigour, identical with true criticism. Never let us attribute to a sincere and candid testing of the Gospels, and of Holy Scripture in general, the evils appertaining to criticism falsely so called. Even the most certain facts of faith are not, in the fullest sense, our own possession, till the sharpest, most vigilant, and most practised spiritual intellect has freely admitted and appropriated them. If man is to be fully blessed, his understanding, no less than his other powers, must be fully satisfied.

This pure interest has, in any case, less to do with those highly partial dialectics which would now obtrude upon it as 'Criticism,' than William Tell with John the Parricide; for it is the interest of 'Criticism' of this kind always to sever the ideal as widely as possible from the real. Hence arose the canon, that if any narrative of the Gospels shows a gleam of ideality, or betrays any symbolical light, its historical nature is doubtful. This monstrous error, followed out to its results, denies Christianity itself. For what is Christianity but the announcement of the Incarnate Word, and the glorification of the historical Christ in the light of the Spirit? This error, however, in its milder forms, has been widely propagated. It has beguiled even pious and sincere critics, such as Schleiermacher and others. When Schleiermacher, e.g., remarks (on the writings of Luke, p. 47), in contesting the historical character of the narrative of the visit of the magi, 'Has it not, in its deepest foundations, a character wholly symbolical?' &c.—his remark is quite in accordance with this canon. It is the very thing we demand of the primitive facts of Christianity, that they should have a wholly symbolical character, that the universe should be mirrored in them, and that not only in their deepest foundations, as if this crystal were still obscured by its crust of dull ore. Thus Von Ammon, too, lays down the rule (*die Gesch. des Lebens Jesu*, vol. i. p. 4): 'Though even history only attains connection and keeping through the ideal and tendency of

the world, yet the too intimate union of the ideal and the real, of the natural and supernatural, is prejudicial to the actuality of events.' Certainly, it may be answered, the old commonplace reality may, and even *must*, be prejudiced by the (but not too) intimate union of the ideal and the real, it must at last perish ; but this is in order that this ordinary reality, this reality invaded by the illusions of unreality, may not for ever prejudice the ideal in the realization of the true reality. Weisse, in his *Evang. Gesch.*, repeatedly returns to the above-mentioned proposition. 'The historical revelation of God in the Gospel (it is said, vol. i. p. 231) loses nothing of its holy contents, if a part of these contents, instead of being viewed as direct fact of a kind in which divinity exhibits itself more in jest than in earnest, and carrying on, so to speak, a paradoxical, half poetic, half prosaic jest with its own sublimest work, is rather recognised as the genial and intellectual work, in which the group of men to whom the divine revelation of Christianity was first addressed, preserved a productive creative consciousness of that Divine Spirit which descended among them, and of the mode of His agency. It is such a consciousness which has found its thoroughly fitting expression in the sacred legend.' Here, then, the productive creative consciousness of a group of men is to surpass the productivity of the Spirit which descended among them, so that the revelation of the Logos is again overgrown by a new mythology. If Weisse had duly estimated 'the paradoxical, half poetic, half prosaic game' of divinity in the Gospel history as the manifestation of God,—a manifestation, on one side wholly ideal, on the other wholly actual, and therefore specifically Christian,—his writings would not have furnished so many germs, which, growing in rank luxuriance in the works of Bruno Bauer, have shot up under the assumption, consistently developed by the latter, that the creative consciousness of the group of men to whom the revelation was at first addressed produced the whole work of the Gospels. In Strauss and Bruno Bauer this severance between the ideal and reality, so far as the latter is to be described in its full force as individual reality, appears in the form of a well-defined principle.

Strauss will not allow that the ideal was in Christ also the historical (vol. ii. p. 690), though the divine consciousness is said to have been in absolute force in Him (p. 689). It cannot, indeed, be understood how the absolute force of divine consciousness should remain behind the representation of the ideally historical, unless it had to contend with the inflexible material of an obscure primitive substance, in which case the 'absolute' force is mere word. At length Bruno Bauer found the matter of reality so obstinate, that he found it most convenient to view the Gospel history as originating in the vacant space of the fixed idea of the Evangelists, instead of suffering it to struggle in that swamp of Ahriman, which reality seemed to him to form. 'The author,' says he in his *Kritik der Evang. Gesch.*, &c., vol. i. p. 57, speaking of the presentation of Jesus in the temple—'yes, the author has been at work here.

Reality does not manage matters as easily as he does. Reality does not present the appearance of being a work of art, in which, whether in a picture or on the stage, all that is forcible is artistically arranged, so as to suit the spectators and its own component parts ; it interposes a dull and scarcely penetrable mass—it interposes years and conflicts with the refractory material of the intellectual public, between its heroes and those with whom they stand in historical connection,' &c. 'Criticism,' it is said, p. 59, 'is constrained to point out the true historical reality of the ideal, in opposition to the nullity of the supposed facts.' Thus, however, the reality of the ideal remains, though contrasted in a shadowy manner to the nullity of the facts. Criticism, however, is progressive ; for in vol. iii. p. 311, it is said, 'If we so view the Gospels as to overlook their mutual contradictions, *i.e.*, if we abstract from their confused contents a general image, as simple, unprejudiced faith is wont to do, we shall be in the highest degree amazed that they could have possibly occupied mankind for the space of eighteen centuries, and indeed have so occupied them that their secret was not discovered. For in not one, not even in the shortest paragraph, are there wanting views which injure, insult, and irritate mankind.' Here, then, even the ideals which the Gospels contain are condemned as culprits.

But the same author informs us, vol. i. p. 82, how the Gospels must have originated. He leads us into the factory of an Evangelist, in which the religious self-consciousness is occupied with the work of creative self-development in the production of a Gospel. How then is this work going on ? 'As religious self-consciousness, it is entirely possessed by its own matter : it cannot live without it, nor without continually producing and stating it ; for it possesses therein the experience of its own certainty. But as religious consciousness, it views itself, at the same time, as entirely distinct from its essential matter, and so soon as it has developed, and at the same moment that it develops and exhibits it, this matter becomes to it reality, existing independently, above and beyond itself, as the absolute and its history.' That this is said with reference not to the gradual productivity of the Church, but to the literary labour of the Evangelist, is proved by the whole context, and especially by the following remark : 'Belief in these productions is further secured by the fact, that the incentive to their composition, and the first material used therein, was furnished from without, and even by the belief of the whole Church.'

If the above psychological portraits of certain religious authors were laid before a medical college of our days for their opinion, and the precaution used of naming neither the originals nor the artist, they could scarcely pass any other judgment than that these authors were deranged.

The author had already thus depicted the Evangelists, before the decision of the Evangelical Theological Faculty of Prussia had appointed him to his theological office.

The critical tendency here pointed out proceeds, then, from a

philosophical principle opposed to the perfect union of the actual and the ideal. This tendency has already settled down into the constant practice of suspecting a Gospel fact to be unhistorical, if similar facts occur in the Old Testament. Neither, in this respect, has it been thought sufficient to compare together mere accessory incidents of the Old and New Testaments. When, *e.g.*, in the one, Moses, coming down from the mount, finds the people in the midst of wild amusements, and in the other, Christ, descending from the mount of transfiguration, finds a helpless multitude, perplexed disciples, and in the midst of the sad group the demoniac boy and his afflicted father, this is said to be a similarity which makes the New Testament narrative suspicious. (Bauer, vol. iii. p. 59.) ‘Moses, indeed, when he ascended the mountain, left Aaron and Hur and the seventy elders below, that whoever had any matter might apply to them. So also were the disciples left at the bottom, while the Lord was on the mount, and so was a matter actually brought before them.’ It is well known, too, how the later books of the Old and New Testament, and similarly related phenomena, have been placed in battle array against each other. Such a mode of procedure must, however, be protested against for the sake of the ideal itself. If in proportion as history becomes rich in significance, refers in its accounts of great persons to still greater, alludes in its statements of extraordinary events to the most extraordinary, and, being more and more penetrated by the eternal light, points with increasing plainness to the rising of an eternal sun of reconciliation between the ideal and the actual, it is to be viewed with suspicion, this amounts, however unconscious the organs of such criticism may be of the fact, to a progressive theoretic brutalization of reality;—a process at first confined to its memorials, but, after their destruction, extended to its very self. (See Apokal. xiii.)

We now pass from the theoretic to the ethical motives of this criticism. It is evident that many of the assumptions lately made in criticising the Gospels, and the Scriptures in general, can only be explained on the supposition that those who hold them must occupy a doubtful position with relation to the moral sublimity of primitive Christianity and its instruments. If any one were to assert that Schiller, in his *Wilhelm Tell*, intended to depreciate the Germans in comparison with the Swiss, that Göthe, in his *Faust*, intended to undervalue German students and citizens, every one would zealously protest against points of view so very subordinate and insufficient. If, moreover, an acute observer were to maintain that he could still perceive in the glowing ruby traces of its material basis, the clay, and that in its ruddy hue he still saw the remains of the red soil, or that in the sparkling diamond he could recognise its primitive parent, the common black charcoal, so acute a natural philosopher would be dismissed with a smile. The canon would be acted on, that in the matured phenomena of a higher grade of existence, the agents of the decidedly surpassed grade can no more appear as factors, or in unbroken masses and forms. It is accord-

ing to this rule also, that we must judge those critical representations which suppose they have discovered in the fourth Gospel, now a neglect of Peter in comparison with John, now an over-estimation of Andrew; or in the third, a miserable tendency to a compromise between Pauline and Ebionitic Christianity; or in the Acts, an effort to exalt Paul by the juxtaposition of his history with that of Peter. Did not the disputes of the disciples for precedence end with Good Friday? Can we doubt their maintenance of their new point of view, when they could so freely confess their old one to the world, and speak of it as the sinful folly of a former time? Could they have again so pitifully sunk from the sublime height of suffering and triumphing with Christ? Is it not rather this over-refined criticism, which insists on seeing the red clay in the ruby, which must be designated as deeply degenerated—as fallen from the heights of Christian theology, which believes in the article of the Holy Ghost in the Church, to the point of view of '*Kabale und Liebe*', to a condition in which it discovers even in the Gospels the well-known fruits of literary intrigue, because it seeks everywhere only its own flesh and blood? Hence arises the miserable assumption, which seems to have almost formed itself into a school, that primitive Christianity was radically an Ebionite, and therefore *a mutilated Christianity*; and that it was not till afterwards that a pure catholic Christianity cast off this mutilating element.

It cannot be denied that Ebionite elements existed as *accidental, suppressed, restrained* principles in many members of the pentecostal Church. But if even the fundamental principles of this Church had been attacked by this Ebionitish nightmare, we should then obtain an image of a redeeming, world-moving fact, which had itself entered the world crippled and needing redemption. But primitive Christianity passes by such observations in its pure New Testament purity, and it is the task of true criticism to get rid of combinations which transform into moral caricatures the glorious forms of the Gospel narrative. It is in the nature of things that the methods of spurious criticism should correspond with its principles. We have said what seemed most necessary in this respect in the body of the work, and have also adduced proofs; while for the more detailed corroboration of our assertions we have referred to the best known works on this subject. As, however, it might seem to many but reasonable that more copious proofs should be adduced, we here cite some which are met with in the works of Strauss and Bruno Bauer, contrasting the actual facts with the treatment they have experienced at the hands of the above-named writers.

Papias, one of the Fathers, expresses himself in the following manner concerning a Gospel of Matthew: 'Matthew wrote *λόγια* (a Gospel writing) in the Hebrew language. And this every one explained (or translated) as best he could.' Thus Papias refers (1) to a Hebrew Gospel of Matthew; (2) to efforts at explanation, or translation of the same, of varying value. This fact is thus treated by Strauss: 'The Fathers, indeed, referred this testimony expressly

to our first Gospel ; but there is not only *no* (it should have been *no decided*) reference thereto in the words of the apostolic Father, but the apostolical writing of which he speaks cannot be directly (this directly is needless) identical with it, because, according to the evidence of Papias, Matthew wrote ἐβραϊδί διαλέκτῳ, while the fact that our Greek Gospel of Matthew is a translation of the original Hebrew, is *merely assumed* (it ought to have been added, *in agreement with the evidence of Papias*) by the Fathers.'

The same Papias says of St Mark, that, as companion and interpreter to Peter, he received his Gospel orally from that apostle, and afterwards committed it to writing. The above-named critic says, 'Our second Gospel *cannot* have been derived from remembrances of the tradition of Peter, and thus from an original source peculiarly its own, *because* it is evidently compounded from the first and third, even if only from recollections of these. Here we have (1) the much disputed hypothesis, that St Mark's Gospel was derived from St Matthew's and St Luke's, laid down as an established fact ; (2) it is represented as an impossibility that a man's *own* remembrances should take the same form in which others had expressed the same experiences. Two wonderful delusions !

Again, there is no evidence existing that Polycarp, the disciple of the Apostle John, knew the fourth Gospel, or described it as the work of that apostle. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp (who, however, mentions St John as the author of the fourth Gospel), adduces no such evidence. An early statement of the critic is as follows : 'There is no evidence given by Polycarp, who is said to have known John, *not even in what remains of his writings* (viz., a single short epistle), that John was the author of this Gospel : even Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, cannot appeal to one sentence of his master in favour of its genuineness' (directly opposed to fact). In a later statement he says, 'It must excite surprise that Irenæus, who already had to defend John's authorship of this Gospel against opponents, neither on this, nor any other occasion, &c., appeals in this matter to the most important authority of this apostolic man.' Would, then, this appeal to his own youthful reminiscences have been a public means of proof ? His declaration at least leaves this reminiscence to be inferred. But what if Irenæus, in proof of his own declaration, had said : It is the case, for Polycarp once told me so ?

Once more, Mary receives the message of the angel that, by the miraculous agency of God, she shall become the mother of the Messiah, and 'is found with child of the Holy Ghost.' Joseph learns her condition, probably from herself, though we are not told so ; he mistrusts her, and is about to put her away ; but the information of an angel gives him the confidence he needed. The critic says, 'They who insist that Mary did not act in the manner which the Evangelists certainly do not assume (viz., concealing the secret from Joseph), must suppose her to have communicated the angelic message to her betrothed immediately after its reception, and that he gave no credence to her information, and will then have to find

some way of clearing the character of Joseph.' What kind care for the character of Joseph! The critics would certainly have believed the most extraordinary event on the word of the pious Virgin. Joseph did not, which made him a character, and preserved him, by the bye, from the opposite reproof of the critic, that he was without a character. According, however, to the present requirements of the critic, Joseph ought, on the mere assurance of his betrothed, to have met the reproaches of the whole world, and said: The miracle is certain, for Mary herself tells me so!

Again, Christ did not, when dealing with the Jews, appeal to His miraculous origin. The fact is easy of explanation. This mystery is conceivable only by those who are initiated into the depths of the Christian faith, and is one which could not be announced to the profane, as being, more than any other, liable to profanation. Our critic says, 'All his contemporaries esteemed Him a son of Joseph (as indeed in a civil point of view He was), and not seldom (twice at least) was this contemptuously and reproachfully expressed in His presence, *and a decided opportunity thus afforded Him of appealing to His miraculous conception.*' That is to say, of declaring: This mystery is true; my mother Mary told me so. Certainly 'Criticism' would forthwith have believed Him.

According to the Gospel of St Luke, a family relationship existed between Mary and the family of John the Baptist. It might consequently be presumed that John was acquainted with Jesus before the Baptism of the latter. This seems, too, to have been actually the case, since, according to Matthew, the Baptist, on the appearance of Jesus, immediately uttered an exclamation expressive of the deepest reverence. According however, to the fourth Evangelist, the Baptist said, with a retrospect to a time prior to that when the heavenly manifestation at Jesus' baptism had accredited Him as the Messiah: I knew Him not. The remarks of our critic are as follow: 'If John were personally acquainted with Jesus, in conformity with Luke's account of the relationship existing between them, it is impossible that he should not early enough have received the information, how solemnly Jesus had been announced as the Messiah, both before and after His birth; nor could he have subsequently said *that he knew nothing of it (I knew Him not!)* till he received a sign from heaven, but would have stated that he had not believed the account of the former signs, *one of which had actually occurred to himself*' (as he perhaps remembered, in his mother's womb). That is to say, that unless the Baptist wished to appear as an unbeliever, incredulous even concerning his earliest impressions, in his mother's womb, he would, in consequence of his youthful reminiscences, have announced with prophetic confidence and authority that Jesus was the Messiah; and if questioned concerning *his divine assurance and credentials*, have answered: *My mother Elisabeth told me so.* Thus would criticism have it, assuring us it would have given more credit than believers in the Bible could have done to the assurances of the pious women in this great theocratic vital

question, nay, that it would have inconsiderately believed them, and, with an entire misconception of its office, have preached the mystery upon their authority. How sublime, on the contrary, is the conscientiousness of the Baptist when he says, I knew Him not! But after the striking sign from heaven he knows Him. In the kingdom of God affairs are conducted with more diplomatic exactness than most critics imagine.

One of the most pointed and sublime of the sayings of Jesus is that recorded by St Luke (ch. xiii. 33) : 'I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following ; for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.' Every unprejudiced reader must at once feel and understand the greatness of this saying. The critic Bruno Bauer makes the remark, 'Where is the dogma written, that no prophet can perish out of Jerusalem, or what antecedents could lead Jesus to a dogma of this kind ?'

If Christ demands of His hearers, at one time, that they should believe, at another, that they should watch and pray, or even that they should fast with anointed face, we are nevertheless convinced that His demands are everywhere identical, because prayer is the expression of faith, and fasting is to be grounded on the heartfelt devotion of faith. The same critic observes, concerning the narrative of Mark ix. 14-29, 'It is certainly a contradiction, when the Lord, in the same breath, requires faith, and fasting, and prayer, as the condition of one and the same work.'

According to Matt. xviii. 1-5, Jesus places a child in the midst of His disciples to reprove their ambition, and says the words : 'Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.' The critic says, in answer to the childish question of the disciples, Jesus takes a child—we should like to know where it came from, since, according to the original narrative, the transaction took place in the house in which Jesus and His disciples were resting after their journey ; we should like also to have seen the perplexed face of the poor child, placed in the midst of the disciples, to serve for a lecture to them—and after He had set it in the midst of His disciples—a piece of cake would have pleased it better,—He said, &c.' 'We should like to know where it came from !' 'A horse, a horse ! my kingdom for a horse !' As the fugitive despairing king cries out for a horse, so does the critic seem here to be crying out for a child to save the veracity of the Gospel history, which has been committed to his keeping. Or does not the matter rather stand thus : if in this place a child were anywhere to be had, if a child should but have stepped into the midst, the critic is annihilated.

We must indeed remark, that all the regular mental activity which, under the name of criticism, has presented so strange and meteor-like an appearance in the province of New Testament theology, 'has surpassed itself' in misrepresentations, contemptuous jokes and blasphemies, in the third vol. of Bruno Bauer's *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte*.

It were much to be wished that some young theologian, endowed with a sufficient amount of good-humour, would bring out a harmony of the principal modern critics of the Gospels. If the great discrepancies of these writers were collected together, or arranged for contest with each other in only a moderately striking manner, a sad exhibition would be presented. It would be seen that here, as formerly in the camp of the Philistines (1 Sam. xiv. 20), ‘every man’s sword was against his fellow,’ and there would be ‘a very great discomfiture.’ The scene would, however, be followed by the conviction, that there is in this world nothing more uncertain than a certain ‘knowledge,’ viz., the knowledge of those knowing ones who, as a reviewer in Tholuck’s *Anzeiger* strikingly remarks, make their inferences with ‘arguments like blackberries.’ It may be hoped that times more propitious for the scientific development of the theological material of the Gospel history will very soon appear, when the produce of decidedly antagonistic criticism may be disposed of in very short archaeological foot-notes. Meanwhile, the contest must be carried on, on this field, in spite of the ill-will and disgust of him who wages it. It must not, however, be forgotten, that the first and more formidable leaders of antagonistic criticism have not concerned themselves with mere Gospel pictures alone, but also with the frames in which the older harmonistic theology had enclosed them. The steady, clear, and discerning eye of a connoisseur will not indeed let itself be prejudiced against the tranquil beauty of an old picture by the inappropriateness of its frame; but the frame may, by its contrast of tawdry finery and repulsive dirt, prejudice even against the picture one who bestows upon it a more hasty though candid inspection. Those critics who have misconceived the Gospel, must take it into account that anxiety with respect to the agreement of the evangelical records was already in the house before they so violently assaulted the door, and that the anxiety disappeared in proportion to the violence of their attack. The first unbelief was ecclesiastical official zeal, which forced the letter of the Gospels into harmony, because it had neglected, nay, almost forgotten, their internal unity.

The work which I have commenced shall, by God’s help, take its part in the efforts now making to exhibit the internal unity of the Gospel history. The first part is sent forth with a lively feeling of its known and unknown defects. The book, however, certainly stands prepared to be ‘annihilated’ by one party, to be possibly ignored, or even unworthily treated, by another. They who, with the author, recognise the manifestation of eternal life in the centre of humanity, of the world, and of time, or who at least have not suffered the great and simple sense of this eternal life to be perplexed by the phantom-like contest of ancient and modern delusions in our days, will receive the work in a friendly spirit. May it, if in ever so small a measure, contribute to those signs of spring which foretell an approaching vernal season to the Church!

THE AUTHOR.

ZURICH, Nov. 5, 1843.

FIRST BOOK.

THE INTRODUCTION.

PART I.

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECTION I.

THE INCARNATION OF GOD.

THERE is an eternal relation between God and man. From the human stand-point, which is also the stand-point of the spiritual life, we can form no conception of man without God, nor of God without man.

The attempt has indeed often been made to conceive of man without God. But it has always been found necessary to designate that infinite contrast to his nature, that mighty objective power on which he is dependent, by some name. And thus some sort of God has always been given him again—an obscure image of God, indeed, instead of the living God. Perhaps he has been made dependent upon fate, and thus upon a gloomy and inexorable God; or upon nature, and thus upon a dreamy God, a God without freedom; or upon humanity, and thus upon a God full of wants, exposed to danger, and without resources. In any case, it has always been found necessary to give to man another God while seeking to deprive him of his own. And even when unbelief has, as in modern times, advanced to the borders of Atheism, and sought to make man the very ruler of himself and of the universe, it has yet found itself obliged to borrow, or rather to purloin from Faith, the word God. It has committed itself to a logical absurdity, and asserted, God is not God, but man is God; being well aware that the proposition, Man is man! would never be so understood as it must be, if man is to be his own God. A plunder of the disputed belief in God was committed, similar to that which is committed upon the belief in a future life, when this is denied, and the present life exalted. What is a present without a future life? The same as God in man, who is to be everything except God. It is, however, a fact deeply planted

in the nature of man, that he cannot be conceived of without God. He loses his human significance so soon as he is viewed independently. He becomes a mythic being, animated at best by a demon, a fantastic monster. The nature of man certainly consists in this, that he is a child of the Spirit, and therefore spiritual ; that he has a sense for the universal and the eternal, namely, reason ; a standpoint beyond the universal and in presence of the eternal, freedom of will, and a capacity for finding and feeling himself in the universal and the eternal, and the eternal and the whole world in himself; the feeling of love. This capacity is not a mere capacity for the general in humanity. The eye of man hails the eternal Spirit even in Orion. It is not merely a sense for the universal ; for in the universal is also ever apparent the variety of the finite, which extends itself by measure and number. The conception of *all* facilitates the comprehension of number ; creation can scarcely be so generally and acutely conceived as when designated by the expression, the world. Reason is rather the capacity of clearly apprehending the eternal Spirit, in which the universal has its foundation from and to eternity, the Spirit which creates and sustains the universal ; in a word, God. What is man without God ? If his spirit embraces only the sphere of earth, and not also the heaven ; if it does not penetrate the heavens, and ascend to that eternal Being in whom time and space are one, or rather in whom they are nothing ; if it does not this, what is it but a mere local instinct, like the perceptive powers of brutes ? What is man's righteousness if it is only the revelation of a law which merely holds men together, and if it is not an entrance into that rule of life which pervades all heights and all depths, and is absolutely universal ? It is then a civil service, but not a spiritual virtue. And is not the love of man deprived of the greatest part of its glory when he is deprived of his God ? Why is a beautiful countenance so mighty to awaken natural love ? Because by his countenance man reveals his personality, and in his personality proclaims the Eternal. And why does spiritual love look up with prayer, praise, and adoration towards heaven ? Because she would embrace all in which she sees the reflection of the Eternal, who has inspired her, and would also cause everything to vanish before the brightness of His nature. Heaven is the world which stands in the reflection^{*} of God, and which vanishes before the majesty of His being. The heavens flee before Him. But if you limit man with his love to earth, if you take from him the 'enthusiasm' whereby he loves the enthusiasm of his neighbour, you take from him his humanity. Woe unto him when the human countenance, in its mysterious significance, is no longer lovely in his eyes ; when he no longer greets it, in its relation to the Eternal, as the sacred manifestation that he is destined for God !

On the other hand, we cannot conceive of God without man. We come to a mature knowledge of God through acquaintance with His attributes. But His attributes express the relations of His nature to reasonable beings, to beings whose existence must, at least by us,

be apprehended through the human type of spiritual creatures. God is righteous. How can His righteousness be manifested, but in relation to spiritual beings who are to be its objects? God is love. How can He be love without calling into existence beings worthy of His love, that is, beings of His own nature? But when the deepest of the divine doctrines, the doctrine of the Trinity, is fully developed, it must be acknowledged that God has from eternity cherished His Son in His nature, and that in His Son He has ever beheld and chosen man. Thus also does holy Scripture conceive the nature of God. He is the God of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob. He has an eternal covenant with His elect. He loved and chose them for ever, before the foundation of the world. They who assert that God might very well have left the world uncreated, obscure the eternity of His love, while intending to exalt His freedom. But they obscure not only His freedom by representing it as absolute and arbitrary, but the eternity of His word, and even His very personality, when they transform the eternal reality of His being into a state of uncertainty, or the contemplation of a bare possibility. We cannot conceive of God without Christ, nor of Christ without man; therefore we cannot form a conception of God without manhood.

It lies in the very nature of the love of God that He will not remove from man, and it is equally in the nature of the destiny of man that he cannot remove from God.

When the prophets speak of God's covenant oath which He swore by Himself, that He would bring man again into union with Himself, they express figuratively, but with the most glorious assurance, the truth that the relation of God to man is an eternal one, and that He will never remove from him. He cannot change His nature. But His nature is love, which has fixed upon its object from eternity. His love is as strong as hell and as death. Even when He punishes man, and casts him down into hell, He manifests, by the jealous zeal of His justice, that He will not remove from him. And if the strongest and hardest words be uttered concerning the separation between God and man in his evil nature, if the eternity of punishment be spoken of, what else is said but that the punishments of hell are divine and heavenly? Is then eternity an infinite number of years, or the endlessness of time? Mutilated theological notions have certainly caused an arithmetical to take the place of a religious idea of eternity. But eternity, as a religious idea, is the infinite, the divine, in time itself. Only where God is, is eternity. Hence the eternity of punishment is the consecration of punishment, in which God is present to the lost in holiest concealment. But where He is present, His whole self is there,¹ even as love. God never removes from man.

But neither can man remove from God. He cannot, even if he would. His conscience is the objective religiousness of his nature, and this becomes his torment in proportion as he, by subjectively blinding his nature, converts it into an irreligious one. In propor-

¹ [Augustine's 'quæ imples omnia, te toto imples omnia.'—ED.]

tion to the dislocation of a limb do we experience pain and utter cries for healing; and thus is it also with man's spiritual perversion. Man cannot free himself from the eternal relation of his being to the being of God: he cannot put off his moral nature and assume a merely physical nature, nor become a pious animal instead of a pious spirit. If he tries to make himself a mere animal, he becomes an evil demon. As, in the mythical primitive slime, the swine and the serpent grew together into a dragon, so man can neither degenerate into the serpent-like diabolic without falling into animal lusts, nor surrender himself to his animal nature without the serpent-like qualities springing up in full malignity.¹ Who ever saw a man part with his religion unharmed? The trust in God which he gives up is changed into positive mistrust, peace into rancour, sound judgment into destructive error, good-will into hatred. The wicked have to do with God as well as the good. They almost talk more about Him, though blasphemously, and their very blasphemies terribly show that they cannot leave God alone. Herein lies the proof of the eternity of religion. The strongest defence of Christianity consists in the fact, that such Christians as would unchristianize themselves become bitterly unchristian and fiercely antichristian. If Christianity were but an incident, a kind of fetish, man could part from it peaceably. But because it is religion, in all its spiritual glory, even the history of its opponents affords the strongest proofs that man cannot remove from God.

It is a part, however, of the nature of that love by which God is related to man, and of that religion by which man is related to God, that there should be a perpetual attraction between God and man—an attraction sufficiently powerful to overcome the repulsion whose tendency is to destroy the relation—an attraction whose aim is the establishment of a relation between God and man which should be nothing less than their strictest union, the glorification of God in man and of man in God, the reconciliation through the God-man. The manifestation of this attraction between God and man is celebrated in the history of the elect in the Old Testament. God appears as the God of Abraham, making a new covenant with him and with his people. Jacob, the representative of the chosen people, appears as the Israel, the man wrestling with God, to draw Him into his own life. The history of God's dealings with Israel is the history of a continuous reciprocity of attraction between divinity and humanity terminating in the God-man, Immanuel. In the course of this process God promises His people that He will eternally betroth Himself to, and espouse them (Hos. ii. 19, 20; Isa. xxv. 7). From the people, on the other hand, arises the yearning cry: O that Thou wouldest rend the heavens, that Thou wouldest come down! (Isa. Ixiv. 1). They are but ill acquainted with the import of the Old Testament religion, who see in it merely the contrast of a commanding God on the one hand, and a people

¹ See Matt. vii. 6.

yielding a forced obedience on the other.¹ This contrast is only the element, the key-note of the Old Testament series; but from the beginning its cause is the free and covenant transactions between Jehovah and the people. God wooed Israel as a bridegroom his bride. A relation of constraint and terror is absolutely out of the question. The history of this great attraction is moreover the revelation of an eternal and fundamental relation between divinity and humanity. The election of Israel is the type and pledge of the election of the world. So Homer sang, first for the Greeks, then for all people. It is time we ceased to see in the covenant God of Israel merely a heathen national God.

But how can it be maintained that the attraction outweighs the repulsion? For this reason, that the attraction is essential, it is part of the nature; the repulsion accidental, an excrescence of the nature. The justice of God is the eternal rule and form of His love. Hence it can never abolish His love, but only conceal it, and cause it to assume the appearance of its opposite. God, in His justice, is angry with the sinner, but He does not hate Him.² His wrath is but the zealous burning of a grieved love, as the storm in nature is a manifestation of the impulse of the air to restore the interrupted balance, or as the catastrophe in history is a manifestation of the zeal of retribution, destroying at a blow the long accumulation of guilt. Therefore mercy rejoiceth against judgment (Jas. ii. 13). But the more man perverts his nature, the more does his nature cry out to heaven, in anguish, torment, and dismay, against its perversion. How long can this state of things endure? It *can* endure eternally, because man is a child of eternity, because he is free. If we say it can only last a hundred, or only a thousand years, we say man is no genuine spirit, he is not really capable of being a demon. But if he cannot be for ever a wanderer from God, neither can he be for ever united to Him; for the possibility of His eternal happiness is involved in the possibility of his eternal misery. This possibility is the outer circle, in which the love of God, almighty love, strives with the lost child of a divine race. Thousands rush into its embrace at the first glance of its countenance. Daily does it celebrate victories, progressively greater and more universal. The slight preponderance of the attraction between divinity and humanity over the repulsion, becomes ever more and more apparent.

¹ Compare Hegel's Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion, vol. ii. p. 74. Hegel has so little comprehended the nature of the Hebrew religion, that he believes he can perceive in the Phœnician religion a transition from the religion of the Old Testament to the supposed more exalted religion of the Greeks, and therefore a spiritual progress, p. 78.

² [Thus the divine anger in its deepest ground is love: love becomes consuming fire to everything which is opposed to it, to the very nature of the good. Love could not be in earnest with itself if it did not negative its negation.'—Müller's *Christian Doctrine of Sin*, Clark's Translation, i. 265. And with what follows regarding the consistency of eternal punishment with God's attributes and man's condition and nature, cf. the satisfactory remarks of the same author, vol. ii. pp. 483-488; also Mansel's *Bampton Lectures*, Lec. vii. p. 220, 2d edit.—ED.]

But the end is their union : God purposes to unite Himself completely with humanity, and to develop in it the fulness of His nature, because He has made it the organ of His manifestation, and impressed His own nature upon it ; because He stands to it in the relationships of the covenant, of spiritual communion, and of love. It is His Sabbath, when He celebrates His manifestation in human hearts. The position which the Mohammedan believes his God to be maintaining—a position of distance from the world—betrays the nature of God. He *must* break through this covering, the world, to communicate Himself to His child. And equally does the separation between God and the world, which the deist interposes by means of a course of natural laws heterogeneous to the religious spirit, contradict the divine nature ; these restraints also must fall. And finally, when the priesthood holds up the Catholic Church as an invisible medium between God and the Christian people, this is also contrary to the nature of His grace, which chooses to be free for the hearts, and in the hearts of men. It is not till God manifests in the Church herself His own nature, His Spirit, and not merely the reflection or terror of His nature in constrained fear and worship—till the Church, therefore, through the glory of His Spirit, testifies, as the priestly bride, of His presence in her midst,—it is not till then, that the attraction in which God offers Himself to man has attained its full purpose.

Man, indeed, may long err and stray from God. He may often pause and decline on his way towards Him. But he does not reach his destination, nor obtain rest, till he has attained to the life of the spirit, in God. We must not be deceived by the strongest, nor even by the most dazzling appearance, in which the constrained religionist (he who is bound to the external temple, to the external sign, to the priest, by natural piety) seems to rest and to worship. A people out of which the priests are taken, cannot, as a laity, have attained its end. A people out of which the theologians are taken, cannot finally rest in undeveloped, unproved, and constrained piety. A people, finally, from which Christ descends according to the flesh, cannot celebrate the festival of its perfection, till it has attained the essential freedom and holiness of the priestly and kingly spirit of Christ. And even should it slumber for a thousand years on the path to its final destiny, it will, it must awaken. The drawing of Christ's Spirit will leave it no rest. Man has not arrived at his destined end till he knows himself to be entirely apprehended by God, and God to be fully apprehended by his inner nature—till he knows even as he is known (1 Cor. xiii. 12).

The life at once divine and human, however, which was to proceed from the union of God with man, could, from its very nature, be perfected only in the most exalted individuality standing in mutual action with the highest universality.

God never communicates Himself to mankind simply in its universality. The communication of eternal life, or of the Spirit of God, presupposes a divine race, raised in its inner nature above the

relations of time and nature—a race of eternal individualities, of imperishable personalities. The argument employed by Christ against the Sadducees, to prove to them from the law the doctrine of immortality, is in fact the most striking one which can be found. God calls Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; consequently they live eternally, for God is not a God of the dead, but of the living (Luke xx. 37). The life of the Spirit of God, then, cannot so be given to humanity as that it should be received by the species only, and not by the individual. For this life does not begin in man till his elevation above the mere life of the species is manifested in the sphere of individual and personal life.¹ God communicates His life to man by entrusting it first of all to the elect, to the most susceptible, the deepest, the most faithful individuals. They, however, do not come to God as strangers: He purposes, He loves, and sends them; therefore they appear in the world. In every elect man there is a threefold relation: first, he appears wholly as a being beloved of God; secondly, as a messenger of God, the instrument of a divine blessing to the world; thirdly, as a central point in humanity, enclosing and embracing as many men as his powers and his mission can reach. Thus we see God enter into communion with universal human life by means of individual life. But will He not proceed from the elect to the more elect in His manifestation of Himself, till the most elect appears? Must not the manifestation of the divine purpose, the Beloved of God, at length appear, in whom the whole counsel of His love towards man shall be disclosed? Once, in the fulness of time, the man does appear who, as the well-beloved of God, forms the centre of the community. Thus is He the One, in the sight of God, by reason of the reality which God hath given Him, in that He hath bestowed upon Him the fulness of His gifts and of His Spirit, that He may communicate them to man. The beloved of God is, however, one with this gift; and hence He is all agency—an agency which penetrates to the very foundation of humanity, and embraces its circumference. Thus is He the very image of God, His manifestation in the flesh.

But for the same reason He is also the Son of man. Man turned with yearning towards God, as He turned with blessing towards him. Man's eye met God's eye. The sighs of humanity pleaded with the Spirit of God. His chosen ones were human saints; His manifestations were made before human faces; His victories were the sufferings of joyful martyrs. Renowned and holy men of God appeared and prepared His way; but in the long series there was none without spot and blameless. In each, the old schism between the flesh and the spirit was alive, in each there was organic imper-

¹ ['Man could not become conscious of God as his God if he were not a personal spirit, divinely allied, and destined for eternity, an eternal object (as an individual) of God, and thereby far above all natural and perishable beings, whose perpetuity is that of the species, not the individual.'—Neander, *Life of Christ*, Bohn's Translation, p. 399.—Ed.]

fection ; in none was there the whole depth of the race, the purity of its origin, the maturity of its aspirations,—till the last descendant of Jesse, the last in the series of the prophets, appeared. On Him was bestowed the anointing with the eternal fulness of God, for He was the God-man. In Him the race of man attained the individual end of its development, its depth, its unity, its approval in the sight of God. By the formation of the divine-human life in the race, its future was prepared ; but it was only by the appearance of the matured divine-human life that it could be bestowed upon mankind in general. Yes, He must first be perfected by the completion of His work and destiny, before the Spirit of God could come upon man as the Holy Spirit. For not till this completion was the sin of the world atoned for, outweighed, and abolished by an infinitely perfect righteousness ; the sinful nature of man consumed to its very core, and transformed by the Spirit of God ; and an agency thus created, which might reach to and change humanity to its foundations, and fill it to the utmost limits of its circumference. Humanity had now, in so far as it was one with Christ, its praise of God in its longing after the righteousness of God, and its Redeemer in Him, according to the whole difference existing between His life and its own. In this glory and redemption of mankind which was manifested in Christ, however, the heart and nature of God Himself were most intimately disclosed to the world—the Son of man is the Son of God. He who was certified as the Holy One in the midst of time, is the chosen One from the depths of eternity. His life is the manifestation of the deep things of God and the deep things of men, in the manifestation of the deep things of His divine-human heart. It is the manifestation of the eternal personality.

NOTES.

1. *We cannot conceive of man without God.*—The atheist is ever employed in destroying a feigned and gloomy divinity while denying the true God, who, as the Eternal Spirit, is love. The materialist believes in a dark Ahriman who has swallowed up Ormuzd. The naturalist makes of the confluence of forces a holy Ganges, which he worships, and in which the personal Being, engulphed and drowned, rushes past him, till he himself plunges into the dark and sacred stream. Feuerbach, in his work *Das Wesen des Christenthums*, lays down the proposition : ‘Man’s knowledge of God is man’s knowledge of himself. God, as God, is only an object of thought. God is the manifested inner nature, the expressed self of man. So far as thy nature, so far as thine absolute self-consciousness extends, so far thou art God.’ If the idolaters of man desire to be consistent, they must renounce the word God. They must manage to make the word *Man* produce the same effect, in their circle, as the word *God* does in the religious sphere. The atheistic anthropology might be expressed somewhat in this fashion : 1. Universal man, the unlimited (called God by believers in God). 2. The individual man, the limited. 3. The man-man, or the unlimited-limited, who leads

men to rush with unlimited limitation against the limits of their nature, that, breaking through them into limited illimitability or unlimited limitation, they may keep the festival of their twofold humanity. This would be about the manner in which they might express themselves if they confined themselves to their own materials, and did not borrow from us the word *God* and all that is involved in it. In any case there is an entirely new logic if divinity is to be denied, in order to ascribe it to man.¹

2. *We cannot conceive of God without man.*—Holy Scripture is from the beginning raised above Deism, and above the deistic philosophy which seeks to honour the freedom of God by giving it an indeterminate exercise over a field of infinite possibility. Scripture knows that God is love, and that in love, freedom and necessity are one. If God, according to Scripture, made man in His own image, He bestowed upon him also the reflection of His own eternity, and the testimony that He had eternally cherished him in His Spirit. When, according to the prophets, He swore by Himself that He would effect the redemption of man, or announced to the believer, ‘I have loved thee with an everlasting love,’ these words contain plain expressions of the eternal Trinity of the Godhead, and testimony to the election of man. Does not the oath of God denote Him as self-determined in eternal determination? Does not the love of God, set upon its object from all eternity, raise that object as on eagles’ wings above the temporal? The New Testament overflows with this acknowledgment, that believers are chosen before the foundation of the world. It is in accordance with the acknowledged spiritual dignity of the Reformed Church, that she has proclaimed this eternity of the love of God, and of the humanity which it chooses and embraces, though she incurs, indeed, the danger of being mistaken by rude conceptions and obscuring representations of this glorious mystery. The Reformed theologians arrived at this doctrine not by the way of Christian speculation, but by that of Scripture exposition; not in opposition to a presupposed absolute temporariness, but to the doctrine of human merit. This doctrine of election is not fundamentally a doctrine of mere election, but a dim intimation of the order in which God appointed the lot of man, whose existence He had already determined: ‘*Paulus, quum docet nos in Christo electos fuisse ante mundi creationem* (Eph. i. 4), *omnem certe dignitatis nostræ respectum tollit; perinde enim est, acsi diceret, quoniam in universo Adæ semine nihil electione sua*

¹ [So Saisset (*Modern Pantheism*, ii. 122): ‘Contemporary Pantheism, forced to choose between an extravagant mysticism which is rejected by all the instincts, good and bad, of our day, and the contrary tendency, decides for the latter, and sacrifices resolutely the personality of God, in hopes of making more of man. What is the result? It destroys human personality. So true is this profound saying of a contemporary spiritualist: “There are two poles of all human science, the personal I, with whom all begins, and the personal God, in whom all ends.” Yes, man without God is an enigma,—I know not what,—an inexplicable monster. He has no mission upon earth, and no hope in heaven. Losing his divine ideal, trying to take himself for his ideal, he falls below himself, and his punishment for desiring to be God is, that he ceases to be man.’—Ed.]

*dignum reperiebat caelestis pater, in Christum suum oculos conver-
tisse : ut tanquam ex ejus corpore membra eligeret, quos in vita
consortium sumturus erat*’ (Calv. Inst. L. iii. c. 22, 1). Here men
are spoken of as already existing in the sight of the electing God ;
a proof that Calvin had not reached the whole depth of the biblical
doctrine of election.¹ Hence it arose, that the doctrine of an elec-
tion to death was connected with the system : ‘ *Prædestinationem
qua deus alios in spem vita adoptat, alios adjudicat aeternæ morti,
nemo, qui velit pius censeri simpliciter negare audet*’ (Ibid. L. iii.
c. 21, 5). In any case, however, the mind of the Reformed Church
was turned towards those infinitely deep things of God, and the
doctrine that God had loved believers from eternity was sedulously
inculcated by her. Contrasted with this view of eternity, how
infinitely imperfect is the speculation which affirms, ‘ Hence time
appears as the fate, the necessity (Chronos, or Moloch ?) of the
spirit, which is incomplete in itself.’² This substance which is the
spirit is the process by which it becomes that which it is in itself,
and it is as this self-reflecting process that it first becomes in itself
truly spirit’ (Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, p. 605). ‘ The
end, the absolute knowledge, or the spirit knowing himself to be
spirit, has for its means the remembrance of spirits, as they are in
themselves, and as they accomplish the organization of their king-
dom. Their preservation, viewed from the side of their free exist-
ence, appearing in the form of contingency, is history, but viewed
from the side of their conceived organization, it is the knowledge of
manifested knowledge’ (Id. *Phänom.*, p. 612). If in the Christian
doctrine of election the spiritual intelligence is present even from
the beginning, and lays the foundations of the world, it does not
arise here till the end of the world, as the result of obscure develop-
ments ; if in the former, spirits, as eternal images of the love of
God, are elevated from ideal into eternal existence, in the latter they
are degraded from obscure and real ‘ contingency’ into the unreal
world of memory ; if in the former, motion served the Eternal Being,
in the latter, the Eternal Being is subject to motion : in the first
system, the ruler is the eternal God, in the latter, One developing
himself out of time, who remembers as a result, like the pale spirit
upon ‘ The place of skulls,’ that spirits have been. It is, however, a
doubtful gain, if, to disencumber the idea of God from the necessity
of Hegel’s system, we so define His freedom in the creation of the
world, as to make it appear to exclude His eternal love, predestin-
ation, and election. J. Stahl, in his *Philosophie des Rechts*, vol. i.
p. 55, notices the more recent system of Schelling in the following
manner : ‘ Schelling calls his present, and the Christian system, the
historical, in opposition to the logical system of recent philosophy.

¹ [On Calvin’s statement of the doctrine of election and its relation to subsequent deliverances, see Cunningham’s Works, vol. i. pp. 358-370.—Ed.]

² Compare Marheinecke (*zur Kritik der Schelling’schen Offenbarungsphilosophie*, p. 43. The author seems to overlook the fact that every philosophical system, regarding God as a mere process-God, is infected with the spirit of Moloch.

For according to the latter, the world and every individual thing is necessarily included in the nature of God; according to the former, it arose through His voluntary creation.' He therefore also calls his system 'the system of liberty,' and 'the positive system.' For it views all things that exist as existing because they exist, because their almighty Author chose that they should, not as existing because they 'could not but exist.' The assertion, that it was possible that all that exists might not have existed, opposes the Christian doctrine of election, and also the idea of a God eternally determined by Himself in Himself. If absolute and mere possibility be attributed to Him, He is made uncertain in Himself, and thereby imperfect; if He is contrasted with such a possibility, it appears as a tempter to that eternal love which is one with Himself. In the glory of that love, all the arbitrariness of freedom on the one hand, and all the constraint of necessity on the other, disappear.

3. *God never communicates Himself to mankind in its universality.*—Both the mystic and the scholastic pantheist, having but a mutilated notion of human individuality and personality, cannot but mistake the true significance of the historic Christ. The first maintains that Christ becomes individual always and merely in the children of the spirit: I am Christ, says he, and thou art Christ: every man of the spirit is to become a Christ. He misconceives the organization of men, their disposition to catholicity, according to which it would be contradictory to reality, and also to truth, if there were a Christ from house to house, if the one Christ did not live in all Christians (compare Andersen's *Das protestantische Dogma von der sichtbaren und unsichtbaren Kirche*, p. 56, &c.) The philosophic pantheist, on the contrary, maintains that Christ cannot become individual, but can only appear in the universality of the human species. 'If reality is ascribed to the idea of the unity of the divine and human natures, is this equivalent to the admission that this unity must once have been actually manifested, as never before nor since, in an individual? This is not the manner in which the ideal is realized: it is not wont to lavish all its fulness in one specimen, and be niggardly towards all others—to express itself perfectly in that one instance, and imperfectly in all remaining instances; it delights rather in pouring out its abundance among a multiplicity of specimens, mutually completing each other, in an alternation of now appearing, and now again disappearing individuals. And is this no true realization of the idea? Would not the idea of the unity of the divine and human natures be a real one in an infinitely higher sense, if I regard the whole human race as its realization, than if I single out a single individual as such a realization? Is not an incarnation of God from eternity a truer one than an incarnation confined to a definite period of time?'¹ (Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. 3rd edit. p.

¹ [The equally significant and closely connected sentences may also be given. 'The key to the whole of Christology is this: that an *idea* instead of an *individual* is set forth as the subject of the attributes which are predicated of Christ by the Church; but then it is a real idea, not a Kantian or unsubstantial one. In an individual, a God-

767). This view of humanity, which deludes itself with the notion that the idea must be niggardly towards all others if it lavishes its fulness upon one specimen, can proceed neither from history, nor philosophy, nor poetry, nor a knowledge of human nature; it is one of those hollow phrases of pantheistic abstraction, which overlooks all the differences of personality in mankind, and can only have meaning in a state of things in which the eternal personality of individuality is dishonoured, and individuals are esteemed mere 'specimens.' For does not history teach us that an idea can be generous to others, while lavishing more or less, or even its whole fulness, upon one 'specimen'? Has, then, the idea of criticism been niggardly towards others, while bestowing its especial favour upon a single individual in our own days? Have the characteristics of the ideal been described by philosophy as such that it must be seized and carefully pocketed, like money, in the presence of others? Does poetry teach, does nature teach us thus to estimate the spiritual relations of humanity? But it may be easily proved that a divine-human, or spiritual life, which is not individual, is a contradiction. All the products of nature are supported by one eternal Spirit, and all unitedly proclaim that Spirit; and yet no natural production, as such, is a partaker of the Spirit, or a spiritual being. But man has the Spirit, and it is this which raises him above the rank of a specimen. Each individual has in truth the Spirit as a person, and not merely a portion of the Spirit. But it does not follow that the measure of the Spirit is not various, that the Spirit does not overflow from some chosen instruments for the enrichment of others. Now that which is true of spirit in its general nature, is specially applicable to the Holy Spirit of the divine-human life. If He were not individually present, He would not be present at all. For such is the nature of the Holy Spirit that He exalts man to the honour of a personality, eternally chosen by God, reconciled to Him, filled with Him, and raised far above the feeling of being a mere exemplar of his species. But if He is to appear in individuality, His outpouring will correspond with the nature of its organ. The most glorious organ, the central organ, the head of mankind, corresponding in the eternal organism of humanity to the fulness of the Godhead, will be the medium through which this fulness is poured out upon humanity. With this agree the following writers: J. Schaller, *Der historische Christus und die Philosophie*, p. 106, &c., though the usual spiritualistic views of the resurrection of Christ are found, p. 130; Conradi, *Christus in der Gegenwart, Vergangenheit und Zukunft*; Göschel, *Beiträge zur spekulativen Philosophie*

man, these attributes and properties are contradictory, but in the idea of the race they harmonize.' And it may here be remarked, as an illustration of the impotence of even the most reckless and fantastic error to create, that this ideal Christology was, in its tangible results, though grounded on and dressed by a different philosophy, anticipated by Celsus, one of whose objections runs thus: *τι δῆποτε εἰς μίαν γνῶναν ἔπειμψε τοῦτο πνεῦμα; δέον πολλὰ ὄμοις διαφωνῆσαι σώματα.* The whole passage is interesting in this connection, and will be found Orig. cont. Cels. ed. Spencer, p. 329.
—ED.]

von Gott und vom Gottmenschen, which is rich in suggestive thoughts; the essay of A. Schweizer, *über die Dignität des Religionsstifters* in *Studien und Kritiken*, Jahrg. 1834, iii. and iv.¹

4. The higher the nature of the life that is to be diffused among men, the more significant is its concentration in individuals; and the more extensive is the circle of influence proceeding from these individuals. Man first appears in the qualities of his merely natural life. In this respect all are equal. All, e.g. were once children. In these qualities, all are for all. Man next appears in the more distinct quality of sexual life. In this respect one half of mankind is for the other. Man further appears in the still greater distinctness of family life, as manifested in races, in which appear the first foundations of the organization of mankind; and here groups are for groups. The development of this great natural organization forms the nations, which exhibit an organism whose delicate adaptations become ever more apparent as the holiness of Christian nations increases. This scale of natural qualities everywhere points to the region of spiritual life. The sphere of imperishable and spiritual life is announced in the universal appearance of individuality. The individual is plainly an organ of the universal, and of the divine administration of the universal, and not only an organ, but a tone, a peculiarity thereof. Every man is the only one of his kind. If he renounces this uniqueness, as, e.g., in a state of slavery, in partisanship, in a monastic order, this always takes place with the conscious or unconscious reservation, that he will reclaim his peculiarity. And, indeed, he must do so; for each man has his peculiar mission. The Father will not receive him into sabbatic rest in His bosom, till he has delivered His message, till, from his special point of view, he has protested against all that is erroneous in the world. What could even an infinite collection of nullities have to testify? Every individual must, indeed, rise to the universality (catholicity) of the kingdom of God; but this he can only truly attain to by the purest development of his own nature. The region of individual life is everywhere pervaded by a gentle breathing of the Spirit, a gale of eternity. But not until the province of individuality is duly estimated as that spiritual kingdom in which each man variously manifests the Spirit, does unity reappear in the midst of diversity, since the Spirit is always one and the same. And thus, as His instruments, all are for all.

In this general circle, however, special talents appear. These are the comprehensive, the auspicious forms of various kinds, in which are concentrated the blessings poured out upon the race, or even the curse which desolates it. As representative forces, as

¹ [To these may be added, Mansel's *Bampton Lectures*, 1858, especially Lecture v., in the notes to which lecture a great mass of information on this point is contained; Dr Mill's *Observations on the Application of Pantheistic Principles to the Criticism of the Gospel*, or, as it is more commonly styled, *On the Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, Cambridge, 1861; and for the understanding of the present position of pantheistic philosophy, and its application to the points under discussion, Saisset's *Modern Pantheism*, Edin. 1863.—Ed.]

representative spirits, they draw together the scattered operations of human life, and collect them into a unity, to pour them out again in individual freshness on the mass. In special talents, the general capabilities of races are exhibited in happy forms and peculiar groupings; and these talents, when they answer their appointed end, advance the good of the race. Thus the many are for all.

But the men of genius form a still narrower group, and their sphere of operation is greater than that of the men of talent. It is characteristic of their operations that they are, not indeed absolutely, but relatively, of a creative kind. They bring to maturity that which is in process of formation, and introduce something new into the world, a new blessing or a new curse. They make mighty efforts in behalf of their contemporaries. They are in constant danger of being either idolized or persecuted, because the power with which they are filled, flowing from them in wide circles, repels all that is inimical, and moves and shakes to its very depths all that is congenial.

But the men of genius also, within their own circle, present a rich variety, and separate themselves into their special departments, though it is of the nature of genius to exhibit a high degree of generality. It is by decided limitation on one side or the other, that talent obtains its appointed power and brilliancy, while genius, as such, is always more or less universal genius. And yet in most, a special kind of power is prominent, pointing out to each his special field. In consequence, however, of this division, there are but few in each field. There are but few great artists, great poets, great philosophers; still fewer great prophets. Many are called, but few are chosen. Thus the few are for all.

In the tendency, however, of genius to the universal, we already find the striving after the highest unity. The elect were the prophets of the One Elect. The express image of the Divine Being and of humanity was at some time to appear in one personality, in which the creative forces and principles should solemnize their union, and thus exhibit themselves in a new, a second, a higher man. This One is the concentrated expression of the tendency of all mankind towards the Eternal: therefore, the Son of man. Hence His agency extends to the whole race. Thus the One is for all.

From this head, and from His agency, is developed the infinitely rich and marvellous organization of the life of mankind.

SECTION II.

THE PERSONALITY OF MAN.

The existence of personality in man is accompanied by individuality. So long as man lives in a savage and brute-like state, he seems to be, more or less, a mere exemplar of his species. It is

said to be difficult to distinguish one countenance from another among the wild hordes inhabiting the steppes of Northern Asia. The peculiar nature of man is in this instance still hidden, and he appears merely a savage creature, or, to speak more correctly, a creature who has become savage. And yet these faces, void as they are of expression, recognise each other: the dawning of individuality, at all events, exists. The more, however, man receives the blessing of education, and especially the consecration of religious awakening, the more is individual life developed in him. That infinite singularity becomes apparent, which distinguishes him as a being elevated above the rank of a mere exemplar, and characterizes each man as a hitherto non-existent type of humanity. The certainty of immortality is contained in this singularity. For it is through this that he is a new, a special, a definite purpose of God, an eternal determination of the divine will. With the annihilation of a distinct individuality we should impute a want of determination to God. But the individuality and personality of man are ever mutually developed. It is only because he is an individual that he is a person; and it is only in the infinite definiteness and isolation of his being that infinite generality can appear. It is in the property of individuality that creature existence attains that silvery brightness of spirituality which testifies that the universal, and the voice of God in the universal, can now be resounded by the metal of which it is composed. The sharply defined figure of the crystal is an image of individuality, the sun-light reflected therein an image of personality. The more a man perceives, faithfully preserves, and sincerely develops the peculiarity, the inmost depths of his nature, the more does the fulness of the Spirit, the glory of God, the richness of His world, begin to be manifested in him. Individuality is therefore the eternal form, or even the form of the Eternal. This is the stone against which the prevailing philosophy of the day stumbles and is confounded. She regards the individual as only a limitation of the general. According to her premises, the evil cleaving to substance, the evil of the world, viewed according to Manichean notions, has taken refuge in the form of the spiritual. In her view, all is divine; only the eternal characteristics, the mystic lines which the human countenance forms by its constant expressiveness, these are fatal to her. In her opinion, substance is limited in its divine flow by those lines which form the individual life. It must burst these boundaries and break through their opposition.¹ As the boy plucks the flower to get at its scent, as the

¹ 'The true being of man is rather his deed; in this his individuality becomes actual, and it is this which puts an end to the intention in both its aspects. First, as a substantial, passive existence: individuality presents itself in action as the negative nature which *is* only in so far as it puts an end to existence. Then, again, the deed puts an end to the unutterableness of the intention in presence of the self-conscious individuality, which, in the intention, is infinitely defined and definable. In the fully formed deed this worthless infinity is annihilated.'—Hegel's *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, p. 242. Such statements consist with the crude ideas of the author on Physiognomy.

spiritualist would destroy the letter to find the spirit, so does this last and most subtle Manichean view of nature shatter that eternal form of the spirit, individuality, to advance universal being in its triumphal progress through the ages. Since it makes man originate from a process of nature, he must inevitably sink again into nature. As is the gaining, so is the spending: 'Light come, light go.' But because this view lacks the eternal determination of the spirit, it lacks also the Eternal Spirit Himself. That dark obscure substance in a state of constant fermentation, which is neither self-possessing, self-penetrating, nor self-determined, can neither appear in personality, nor form a real individual. Such philosophy is a stranger to the conception of the eternal.

In the perfect or divine-human life, the contrast of individuality and personality must be manifested in all its heavenly purity. Here we see a man who is never lost and dispersed in mere creaturehood, who never obliterates the constant characteristics of his being; who ever most distinctly expresses in his spiritual nature the eternal appointment of God. He continues true to himself, and therefore faithful to God. His voice was an echo of that purity which it had by the divine appointment; therefore a call of the Father, an announcement of salvation from God Himself. It was thus that Christ appeared to us. He plainly declared His nature and the mission resulting from it, and stamped the intrinsic value of His nature with an impression of most sacred and faithful distinctness. He asserted His spirituality in the presence of all nature. And what was the result? All nature began to shine with spiritual brightness in the mirror of His spirit; the birds of heaven and the lilies of the field became, through Him, thoughts of God. He contended for, and victoriously maintained, against the whole world, the sanctuary of His divine Sonship; and therefore did the whole world, in its ruin and in its call to blessedness, begin to shine with the light of His love and righteousness. His faithfulness to His individuality was also exhibited in this, that He showed to His Father His whole heart, even its grief, that He did not obliterate this distinct feature of His nature in an enthusiastic heroism, which would have hindered the glorification of the Father in Him. By the solemn earnestness which consecrated the place on which He stood, He transformed the whole world into a sanctuary of God; by the constant energy with which He lived in the present, He transformed all ages; by the manner in which He laid hold of passing events, He consecrated them into symbols of the world's history. Yes, the glory of the personal life flowing from Him transfigures both earth and heaven. But while it may be said that He attained His personality in the infinite distinctness of His individuality, the converse is equally true, that He found the unchanging constancy of His nature in His continual and entire submission to the Father. It was by plunging into the sun of personality, that the eagle-like glance bestowed upon Him was developed. And this view of the matter is also the more correct

one. What He saw the Father do, that did He as the Son ; and it was by finding Himself in the bosom of the Father, that He felt and knew Himself to be the Son.

In the personality of Christ is manifested the personality of the Father. When it is said, the eternal Being is light in Himself, in Him is no darkness at all, He possesses, He penetrates, He surveys, He wills absolutely,—what is this but to say that He has personality ? God is the most decidedly personal being, much more so than man, because He cherishes nature not as a necessity to His spirit, but as a form of manifestation for His spirit. But if personality stands in polar relation to individuality, how can God be personal ? Do we then say that God, who is the source of all individual, as well as of all personal life, is not an individual ? His personality is the eternal light of His Spirit, in its self-determining agency; its antitheses are those eternal determinations (*Bestimmtheiten*) which He cherishes in His being, and which are summed up in that one general determination, in that *character* of His being, in His Son.¹ If, then, these determinations appear in time, they are not therefore absolutely temporal. With the nature of Christ, eternity appears in time, because the Spirit of God, which embraces all times, is manifested in Him ; and in proportion as He awakens personality in men, does He awaken eternity in them.

But the personality of Christ not only manifests the eternal personality of the Father, but also proclaims the produced (*werdende*) personality of men. For Christ exhibits in His life the destination of humanity, its inmost depths, which are to be absolved, delivered, and perfected through Him. And thus by His appearing there is also proclaimed the Church, in which the Spirit of life is ever elevating that which is perishable to the light of the imperishable, and glorifying nature as well as mankind. His personality is the pledge to His Church of a future, in which, through its development and perfection, all the obscurities of nature, all the dark mysteries of evil, shall be pervaded by the light of their manifested relation to eternity, and sanctified to the service of God. The Eternal Spirit, as the all-ordinating Being, ordaining Himself in all, is the source of all personal life, the personality of the Father, or even the fatherly personality. The same Spirit, as the Being whose existence is determined with infinite delicacy and sharpness, and who in this determinateness is the Being knowing Himself free, the Blessed One, is the reflection of the Father's glory, the personality of the Son. But the same Spirit, as the Spirit of liberty, bringing back this determinateness of the Son and of His members to the self-determining agency of the Father, through whose presence God is present in His people, so that their life is sunk and lost in His, is the personality of the Holy Ghost, or also the Holy Spirit of personal life, who sanctifies the world, and makes it an offering to God. The special province of the Spirit's operations is the Church, whose several individualities, notwithstanding their infinite diversity, and

¹ ὁς ὡν—χαρακτὴρ τῆς ἵποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, Heb. i. 3.

even by the organic relations of that diversity, form one organism, and at the same time one great collection of individualities.

NOTES.

1. The notions *Individuality* and *Personality* express, according to our view, the nature of spirit in a polar relation. Individuality is the point in which spirit comes forth and distinctly manifests itself in nature ; personality is the circle by means of which it embraces heaven and earth, and perceives God that it may manifest Him. The mutilation of these notions is connected with all the morbid inclination to abstract generality, to the dark depths of indistinguishable substance, prevalent in these days ; and its presence may be traced, like that of a devouring worm, in the principles and tendencies of the new theology. It is evident from the above quotation, that Hegel had not discovered the true notion of an individuality corresponding with personality. *Michelet*, in his Lectures on the Personality of God, &c., seems for a moment to touch upon the true significance of individuality, p. 84 : ‘The true relation of the general and the particular is therefore merely a looking at both sides at once. The particular does but add another definite peculiarity to the contents of the absolutely general, by which peculiarity it is itself distinguishable from other particulars of the same species, just as separate ideas exclude each other through their peculiarities. Particularity is consequently the richest,’ &c. Individuality, however, is not mere particularity, and the general is not so poor as to increase in contents through the particular, as this author thinks. Hence an unsatisfactory conception of individuality is already announced. ‘It is the principle of individuation,—that addition made to generality and speciality,—which forms the great variety, and the distinctive characteristics of individuals. And since the addition is non-essential, all that is great and true in individuals belongs to them by reason of their species.’ The principle of individuation, then, that ‘anonym,’ as Göthe calls it, is here an *addition*, and again this addition is *non-essential*. It is evident that this non-essential addition is incapable of constituting a human race at all corresponding to the ideal. On the contrary, it is really the millstone hung round the neck of the subject, to draw it down into the depth of annihilation. ‘The general process of species, therefore, consists in withdrawing from one series of peculiarities to appear in others. Peculiarity is eternal ; peculiar beings, on the contrary, disappear.’ *Cieszkowsky* also seems, in his work *Gott und Palingenesie*, p. 40, to define incorrectly the relation between individuality and personality, though he maintains the immortality of personality against Michelet. With him individuality is ‘the natural, the indifferent, the co-existent, the inflexible, the incidental, the limited, the most peculiar peculiarity,¹—that which not only cleaves to materiality, but also underlies it.’ According to *Snellmann*, *Versuch einer spekulativen Entwicklung der Idee der*

¹ Certainly the ever singular.

Persönlichkeit, p. 43, 'an individual is a being which thus ever excludes another, but even thereby becomes ever another.' The contrast between the general and the individual being thus designated, in the strongest terms, an unending one, we may well be surprised to find the whole contrast so soon entirely at an end, p. 49 : 'The spirit is not distinguished, as the Ego, from the matter of the consciousness ; it is not that *it has* this matter, but that *it is* this matter. There is here, then, no distinction between consciousness and self-consciousness, but both are directly one. For the spirit, as pure self-consciousness, as the Ego, which moreover *has* the matter of the consciousness, is not a *definite one*, an exclusive individual.' This *indistinguishable* identity (and therefore sameness) of consciousness and self-consciousness is, according to p. 242, the idea of personality. This personality is consequently the monotonous spirit, or rather non-spirit, which comes to itself when first in thought, and afterwards temporally, in natural death, it abolishes subjectivity (244). Feuerbach carries on the degradation of the subjective to the perishable to a degree which shows a hatred of it : 'It is not love which completely fills my spirit ; I am leaving room for my unloving nature by thinking of God as a subject, distinct from His attributes. The notion of a personal self-existent Being is anything but identical with the notion of love ; it is rather something beyond and without love. Hence it is necessary that I should at one time part with the notion of love, at another, with the notion of the subject' (*Das Wesen des Christenthums*, p. 360). Göschel, on the contrary, arrives, by the same premises as Hegel, at the conviction, that it is in the nature of the notion of the Ego, as Ego, as spirit, that the individual Ego is not lost in it, but continues to live and think in it. 'The Ego, in its distinctness from nature, is just this, it is equal to itself. Ego = Ego. Therefore the death of the Ego in the Ego is a contradictory idea' (*Beiträge zur spekulativen Theologie von Gott und dem Menschen*, &c., p. 24). The same author expresses the principle, 'Nothing so much pertains to personality as individuality, and indeed the individuality of the subject' (p. 58). 'The connection is as follows : personality is the highest form of individuality, the pervasive glorification and manifestation of self-existence ; on the other hand, subjective individuality, or independence, is the matter and condition of personality.' Here, then, the polar relation between individuality and personality is expressed. The remarks made by Strauss (*Leben Jesu*, p. 735) against the Church doctrine of Christ, or of the union of the divine and human natures in Him, fundamentally oppose the true notion of personality in general. He appeals to *Schleiermacher*, *Glaubenslehre*, 2, §§ 96–98, where he finds the expression, that the divine and human natures are united in Christ, difficult and barren. Schleiermacher argues specially against the Church doctrine, which receives two wills in Christ, and remarks that, in this case, we must come to a similar decision with respect to the understanding. Strauss seems, fairly enough, to

claim for his assertion the arguments of Schleiermacher, according to which there is said to be something absolutely inconceivable in the Church notion of the God-man. Schleiermacher does not give its full significance to the notion of individuality; consequently he uses a christological expression (p. 56) which even Noëtus or Eutyches might have appropriated. ‘The existence of God in the Redeemer is laid down as a primary force from which all agency proceeds, and by which all impulses are connected: what is human, however, only forms the organism for this force, and is related thereto, as being both its receptive and its expositive system.’ But how should this organism of Christ have been able, without a will, to receive and exhibit the will of God? And the same reasoning applies to the understanding. Is the understanding of two men, whose agency is alternately employed, a double one? But as little is it a single one. The understanding and the will, as well as all that is spiritual, all that is personal, bear within themselves the contrast of the objective and the subjective, whose diversity is explained in identity, and their identity in diversity.

The misconception of the personality of the individual, exhibits itself in two extremes which, though exhibiting a mortal aversion, are yet intrinsically united. The one extreme is the tendency of Jesuitism, as an emanation of the Manichean and ascetic aversion to the individual and its corporeity, which has obscured the Romish Church. The other extreme is the tendency of Communism, resting upon the Manichean and pantheistic aversion to the personal and its perpetual definite peculiarity. The annihilation of personality is the final aim of both these tendencies. In the first case, the most unconditional obedience to the general of the order, the most colossal sectarianism, is to extinguish all individuality. Lamennais, in his treatise *Affaires de Rome*, has some excellent remarks on this subject. The Church of Rome exhibits an increasing tendency to establish this principle. Lacordaire expresses himself in the *Semeur* (No. 23, 1843) in the following manner: ‘*Ce que Dieu vous demande, c'est de sacrifier votre conviction flottante, uniquement basée sur vos passions et vos préjugés à la conviction une, sainte, et perpétuelle de la cité de Dieu; c'est l'abjuration de la cité du monde pour l'adhésion complète et libre à l'autorité religieuse, pour la soumission à l'hierarchie et à l'Église; c'est de vous dire une bonne fois à vous-même: Eh bien c'en est fait, je me donne à une raison souveraine, immuable, plus haute que la mienne; moi, atome miserable, je m'assieds enfin las et confondu sur ce roi inébranlable, qui a pour appui la main de Dieu, et pour garantie de sa durée, son invariable promesse! Ainsi pénétrés de votre nullité individuelle vous rentrerez dans la vie générale.*’ It might be added: *dans la grande nullité, qui résulte d'une telle composition de pures nullités.* On this side, man is required to sacrifice his personality to the mere hierarchy, the historical majority; on the other, to the multitude, the momentary majority, without the prospect of receiving it back free and transformed, which is the

result of the surrender of the life to God. This sacrifice is demanded, because sectarianism, as such, is a gloomy and demoniacal power, which can only be formed by trampling down individuality, a thick cloud in which the beautiful and separate colours of natural life form but one dingy mixture. How bright, on the contrary, is the glory of the true Church, as displayed in her adornment of sanctified individualities and their varied endowments ! From this one fundamental mutilation, there arise, in the courses of the two above-named extremes, a series of mutilations : the mutilation of the rights of property, of marriage, of the State, of the Church.

2. An individual is a creature which cannot suffer the dissolution of its own proper nature by any dissolution of its outward constituents, which no storm of death can strip of the mighty unity formed by its existence. The word *persona* means, first, the mask worn by an actor, then, the character which he represents, and, lastly, an individual, in his characteristic significance. The word personality cannot certainly be referred immediately to *personare*, in such a sense as to make it denote how the general resounds through the individual. But when Snellmann (p. 1 of his Collected Works) calls this ingenious explanation, far-fetched and unsatisfactory, he forgets that the voice of the actor resounds from the mask, and the general life, represented by poetry, from the dramatic character ; that the meaning of the character, moreover, is to express general life in its mature determinateness. It is, at all events, a characteristic trait of pure personality, that the infinite resounds through it.¹

SECTION III.

ORGANISM IN THE PROVINCE OF PERSONAL HUMAN LIFE.

Humanity has its unity first in its natural type, in the primitive natural man, from whom all derive their life and blood. This unity is the unity of species, but also the unity of destination to a spiritual life, and of the perversion of this destination by the fall. This unity has been converted into a sad uniformity—it is the tragic monotony of the race that in Adam all die. This is the unity which is now esteemed by many the peculiar glory of the human race. But the higher unity of mankind has been manifested in the God-man, who, in the infinitely rich and divine nature in which He appeared as the head of humanity, announced, and by the agency of His Spirit brought to light, its infinite variety, and the unity existing amidst this variety. In Christ all are made alive ; and in this life they form that organic community which He so fills and animates with His divine fulness, that they represent the universal Christ. The God-man develops His life in

¹ [This subject is pursued, and treated in opposition to Strauss, in Müller's *Doctrine of Sin*, ii. 159, &c.—ED.]

the organism of the divine-human Church, in whose ideality even nature is elevated till at length God becomes all in all.

The individuality of each man, which is to be delivered and to come to its maturity and glory through the God-man, is the power, dwelling in its personality, of taking into itself and exhibiting all life. All times, all space, all saints, are present in the heart of the humblest Christian. His memory reaches back to the fall and the creation ; his hope extends beyond the close of this world ; his inner life has its roots in the centre of time, in the sacred period of Christ's death and resurrection. The East, whence the Gospel issued, as well as the West, to which it proceeded, is his home. Patriarchs, prophets, and apostles visit him as the familiar friends of his inner life ; infinity nestles in his bosom ; God Himself comes with His Son, and sups with him ; he is an heir of all things. Individuality in its Christian splendour is a diamond whose facets are infinite, that it may receive all the light of infinity.

But the personality of the Christian is an individual one. It is in each a personality infinitely unique, new, and utterly differing from every other. This isolation would repel the whole world, if it were not at the same time personality, life in common. It would be a gloomy divinity, if there could be such a one, if it were not rather, an infinitely limited expression of the eternal God. By means of personality the isolated individual is one with all sanctified individuals ; but this personality, being individual, is again diverse from them.¹ The individual is to represent, in infinite limitation, the infinitely unlimited ; in the special ray of a single character, the eternal Sun. He is an Ego, therefore an immortal being ; a spiritual note in which all creation resounds, therefore also a personality. But because the man restored to his destination by the God-man is both personal and individual, he is a member of the body to which he belongs, of the head from which his life proceeds. He has his special talent, and with it his special relation to all the other members, his special task, his separate stand-point. He has, too, his special one-sidedness, his relative deficiency of talent, in which respect he needs completion by the fulness of the body, and especially by contrasted and kindred members. And even this very deficiency is but a gift of infinite capacity to receive the fulness of blessing stored up in kindred spirits, the means of union with them, of taking up a definite position in the wondrous frame of the body.

When in human life those great individual groups, the nations, oppose and strive against each other, when a constant and painful friction takes place between private individuals, human nature, in this unhappy confusion and self-destruction, seems put to shame by the harmonious association of a flock of antelopes, and by the close ranks of a train of cranes. But even this terrible perversion of its destiny makes it evident that its unity cannot be the uniformity of

¹ Hence, in its perfection, the new name which no one knoweth, saving he that receiveth it (Rev. ii. 17). This is the development of 'the anonym' in the individual.

generic life, the monotony of a collection of exemplars. This continual friction is but the morbid working of the infinite delicacy of its organism, and the loud harshness of the discord testifies to the glory of the lost harmony.

This harmony, this bright and heavenly variety in spiritual unity, is apparent in Christ's kingdom. Peter and John, Thomas and Paul, how different, yet how similar ! how clearly do they manifest in their diversity the oneness of the life in Christ and the heavenly richness of this oneness ! In the free New Testament Church this is the ~~solution~~^{watch} : ' There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God ' (1 Cor. xii. 4-6). It is then a proof of true Christianity to exhibit eternal unity in variety, and variety in unity ; or, in other words, to show individualities in the light of personality, and personalities in the varying hue of individualities.

Antichristianity, on the contrary, is matured in such systems as would annihilate individuality, whether they seek, by stifling the singularity of the individual, to exhibit his religious and heavenly generality ; or, by rooting out his relation to the Eternal, to cherish his individuality, as a merely animal expression of existence. The former deny the true incarnation of God, the manifestation of the Eternal in the individual ; the latter, the divine unction of the individual, his glorification in the Eternal. Both would trample on the honour of the subject, to exhibit the honour of the community ; thus, however, constituting a community without honour, without divine life, or glory. They would break in individuals, catalogue spirits, mechanize personalities. They misconceive the ideal groundwork of humanity, in conformity with which the Church, in the midst of the greatest abundance of efforts, of contrasts, of diversities, will yet, by means of its infinitely delicate sympathies and antipathies glorified by love, have but one heart and one soul, —one heart raised above time, one soul hovering over all space, one society embracing both the living and the dead in God, to whom they all live through Christ, who unites all as their life-giving head. Individuals may be compared to the linked rings which form a single chain, or which, partially enclosing each other, exhibit a rich tissue of spheres. There are great individuals who partially enclose less individuals, but they are all enclosed in the greatest, and form but one organic unity. As one great general comprises whole hosts, as one great philosopher represents a whole race of minds, so does Christ comprehend human nature. In Him dwells the fulness, the deep insight of a John, the energetic activity of a Peter, the ideal resoluteness of a Paul,—in short, the deep spiritual wealth of the race. Thus, too, in decision, purity, and power, He is the head of the race. He was able with absolute and heavenly certainty, from moment to moment, to discern between truth and error, to conquer the tempter, and with perfect freedom to do the very thing which the Father willed to do through Him. His purity was a

bright mirror, reflecting all characters in their several particulars. The murmurs of enemies, the whispers of friends, resounded through His soul. The terrors of earth could pass through His mind. And so clear was His apprehension, that He was as aware of the world's judgment as of His own. But in power also He surpasses the whole human race. The power of His fidelity and zeal for God, of His victory over the world, is a lasting influence which is ever working, and must work till it has attained its end, till at His name every knee shall bow to the glory of God the Father.

The influence of Christ upon individuals is displayed in their attaching themselves to Him, and conditions the relation in which they stand to Him as His flock. But His influence is a holy one ; it respects the freedom of each individual, his destination for God, which is one with the possibility of his condemnation. Hence His Church appears, first of all, in the very-elect and the elect. His influence upon individuals allows of counteraction. He suffers the great contradiction of sinners, and thereby reconciles Himself with them in spite of all their narrowness (this is especially apparent in the relation of the New Testament to New Testament exegesis). But such spirits as follow His leadings, also influence each other. These influences form an infinitely delicate and intricate rhythm : their various relative proportions of fulness, distinctness, brightness, and power give to each a different position with regard to all others. Thus is formed the body of Christ, that eternal organism, animated by the glorious Head, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of God (Eph. i. 23).

In this organism not one tittle of the law passes away; that is to say, every power finds its use and object. Each mind attains its own special experience. Each voice is reckoned upon, and none desires to go beyond the part appointed it, to go beyond its pitch. But each must preserve and manifest its own peculiarity. The honour of God cannot dwell in soundless men, in individuals whose individuality is extinct, whom cowardice has induced to merge themselves in the dark flood of an impersonal substance, or in the opposite but equally dark compound of an enslaved party-nature. The honour of God will dwell in those really honourable ones, those heroes, each of whom has once stood alone beside Christ upon the hill of martyrdom, and has, in spite of all the world, and in order to be faithful to all the world, preserved his most sacred possession for his Lord. These are the children of God, the joint heirs with Christ. Every child of God has received something special, some peculiar characteristic, from his Father. Each is endowed with a power which can concur with the powers of others, but only in Christ. Hence every child of man must be a protestant, must be inwardly independent of every other man, and fall into the arms of Christ, to attain to true catholicity. In each separate Christian, Christ is manifested anew in a special aspect of His divine glory. But formerly, in His personal manifestation, He exhibited in unity

that fulness which is now disclosed in diversity, in His Church ; and thus with Him eternity enters into time.

NOTES.

1. The relations of developed individual life are infinite. How great is the variety exhibited even by a man's social position ! The same individual is at the same time child, husband, father, brother, friend, subject, superior, companion, and fills many other relations too numerous to mention. In each of these several relations his disposition is seen in a different light, or exhibits a different reflection of the surrounding world. Christianity, however, in the perfection of its influence, transforms him into a diamond lighted up by the fulness of God, makes him an heir of God. Are not all men, then, in this respect perfectly equal ? They that are perfect are equal in this respect, that they all see God. But as the image of the sun is larger in a lake than in a dewdrop, and as light assumes different hues in different jewels, so does infinite diversity exist among men with respect to their capacities for receiving into themselves the life of God.¹

2. There is no absolute absence of talent among men, but only a relative one. That side of the individual on which he appears unendowed, is, when rightly improved, that on which he most ardently unites with the whole community, and devotes himself to it. Thus, even limited talent is not a positive limitation, but rather a passive recipiency which makes the individual such a member of the kingdom of God as stands truly in need of its communion and fellowship.

3. In great national wars, national individualities seem to come into collision, that their several and peculiar natures may be more evident.

4. It is quite natural that any single gift of Christ should assume a different aspect in any one of His witnesses, from that which it does in Himself ; for in Him it is modified by the fulness of all gifts. Thus there may seem to be more power in the ministry of John ; but if we compare the words of Christ against Pharisaism with those of the Baptist, the surpassing dignity of Christ's person is perceived even in this particular. All the splendid single virtues in which each of God's heroes have appeared so great, blend in wondrous harmony in Him ; and it is for this very reason that He is the fairest among the children of men, for in His perfect beauty the several and various components disappear in the ideal unity of the whole. On the union of various spiritual gifts in Christ, see *Conradi, Christus in der Gegenwart Vergangenheit und Zukunft*, p. 97, &c.

5. As there should be a due appreciation of both those forms of life, individuality and personality, as harmonious contrasts mutually needing each other ; so should there be an equally just appreciation of those forms of life, Protestantism and Catholicity. The former may be defined as the individuality of the Church in general, the

¹ Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 40 ; Rev. xxi. 19.

latter as its personality. But both these essential characteristics of the Church are united. Through its personality or Catholicity, the Church must be free from all the exaggerations, adulterations, and spurious admixtures of individuality or Protestantism. But, on the other hand, the riches of its personality must be unfolded in its Protestant individuality—its personality must be delivered from the monkish cowl which would gradually stifle its vitality, and from the dead uniformity thereby produced. Catholicity, without Protestantism, is a mere sect. For it is the nature of a sect to repress individuality, to abolish its peculiar gifts and lasting distinctions, in order to exhibit unity. How free, how vital was the Catholicity of the apostolic Church, in which the Apostle Paul boldly opposed Peter in his error at Antioch, and the Apostle James the degeneracy of Pauline Christians ; in which each Church shone distinct from all others in the light of its own peculiar vocation ! We are thus taught how firmly true Protestantism will adhere to true unity, and how this unity of the Church not only permits but requires the free development of the individual life of each of her members.

The Church of Christ should consequently be thoroughly conscious of her vocation. For she has to deal on one side with a sectarianism which would destroy all individuality, on the other, with a separatism which threatens to exhibit a separate church and society in each individual. This sectarianism appeared in the ecclesiastical form of Jesuitism, in the secular one of Communism. Both these tendencies resemble each other in the effort to exhibit a perfect society by the annihilation of its varying individual components. They may be considered as the most matured productions of sectarianism ; the one demanding this false and fearful sacrifice from men to gain the world for heaven, the other to gain heaven for the world. Separatism over against this sectarianism, exhibits an equal measure of error, and indeed in a similarly twofold aspect ; first appearing in ecclesiastical pride, as an enemy of all Church organization ; then in secular pride, as an opponent of all political order in society. The erratic courses, however, of both these enormous exaggerations lie very near each other.

SECTION IV.

THE FULNESS OF THE TIME.

Time and space are no gods, for this, if for no other reason, that time intersects space, and space time. We can, however, hardly escape from the idolatry of these powerful forms of the world's development. It seems most difficult for man to free himself from the notion that time is a god. Even the boldest philosophical systems, unassisted by the spirit of Christianity, in treating of the origin of the gods in time, are for the most part infected with the superstitious assumption that time is itself a god. In this case they

do homage to Chronos, who devours his own children, who consumes personalities ; to Moloch, to whom children are sacrificed ; to the process-god, who destroys individualities in order to become entirely himself. The Grecian was delivered from Chronos by Zeus, who instituted an everlasting Olympus and a transposition of human heroes into the community of the immortal gods. The Hebrew was freed from Moloch by Jehovah, the eternal God, who in His covenant faithfulness is in all ages equal to Himself, and who also elevates His elect to His own eternity. The religious consciousness, however, of many philosophers has not yet attained either to the worship of Jupiter or the service of Jehovah, since they still expose their children by sacrificing the personal immortality of man to a god confounded with time—a god in process of becoming such.¹

This idolatry of time is connected with the idolatry of nature. Nature is the slow development of the Spirit. The greatness of natural philosophy consists in its discovery of the gradations of development in the life of nature and of man ; but it is its limited nature which is exhibited, when these gradations of development are regarded as periods of origin in the consciousness of God Himself. Nature is confounded with the act of creation, and even regarded as the Creator, when the subsequent is looked upon as the mere product of the antecedent, the higher as the mere birth of the lower. Thus the elements are made to arise from an effort and interworking of the original principles of nature, and the organic products from the elements, and always new and higher formations from those already existing, till at length man appears as the head of animal existence. It is indeed quite justifiable to estimate the origin of spiritual life by such gradual developments. But whenever a higher product is formed from one formerly existing, unless origination is distinguished from existence, its highest quality, *i.e.*, its peculiar idea, its soul, and thus the very principle which is essential to it, must be surreptitiously introduced. The natural philosophy which would construct the higher out of the lower, is full of such surreptions. The elements may be made to weave as long as we please ; but if a plant is to be originated, a new idea, and indeed a more concrete and powerful one than that of the elements, must be introduced among them, to assume their material according to its necessities, and to assimilate it into its own life. With each new gradation of life, a new idea actually appears as a new vital principle—an idea certainly announced and prepared for, but not created, by preceding formations. And it is in the very singularity, novelty,

¹ [Hegel, Schelling, Baur, and their followers, are forced by the principles of their philosophy to repudiate the idea of a 'fulness of time' in the Christian sense. As has been shown in a previous chapter, they can admit no such incarnation as this requires, no single, historical incarnation, which happens once for all. To become man is, as it were, God's eternal attribute and destiny, which, as God, He is always fulfilling, and men accordingly are reduced to mere 'phenomenal manifestations' of God. In this sense God becomes incarnate in every man, and through all time ; and if there is a 'fulness of time,' it is only because one man, say Jesus, has more strikingly than others revealed the eternal and infinite.—ED.]

and power, by which it is raised above previous formations, that its peculiar nature is apparent.¹ We shall thus be obliged to allow that new forms in the ascending scale of life do not make their respective appearances merely as natural products, but as the thoughts and works of God. Nature, indeed, dreams of her future, and foretells it in obscure foreshadowings. But these very dreams of nature are only the result of the thoughts of God already working in her, and about to appear in new creations. Thus nature may be said to form a great number of concentric circles. New circles are ever appearing, each tending towards the centre. These do not, however, proceed from nature, but from a new creation and from eternity. Thus, e.g., within the circle of minerals is the circle of plants: within the circle of plants, that of the brute creation; within this, that of mankind; within the circle of mankind, the circle of the elect.

Here, moreover, the subsequent and the higher is not only as primordial as the former and lower; but with respect both to its own importance and the power which appoints it, it does, in the very nature of things, take precedence thereof in the mind of God. What John the Baptist said of Christ, ‘He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for He was before me,’ might equally be said by the plant of the stone, or by the lion of the plant. For the circles gradually tending towards the centre of life ever increase in depth. In each new circle appear the principles for whose sake the former were produced, and which, in their import, include and take up preceding formations.

In man appears the principle of all the days of creation. God first formed the earth, and made plants and animals. But man was nevertheless that principle in the mind of God, whose life called all nature into life.

Mankind forms another rich system of circles. Still deeper and still more powerful natures appear towards the centre,—the noble, the holy ones, the first in the truest sense, though frequently the last to appear. In the centre appears the God-man. Here is the veriest centre of the circle, here its fulness and depth; the consciousness in which God is one with man; hence the whole depth of Godhead and the whole depth of humanity, and therefore the essential principle, the First-born, the Eternal, in whom God made the world.

But because Christ has this significance in the midst of the world’s history, time has its consummation in Him, and eternity appears with Him, and in Him, in the midst of time. Before time was, He was in God as the principle, the root, the motto of the world. Could the world have been conceived as a composition or fundamental idea without a motto? He will be, too, when time is

¹ Compare Streffen’s *Alt und Neu Beurtheilung dreier naturphilosophischer Schriften Schellings*, p. 20; *Rosenkranz, Schelling*, p. 87; *Hegel Logik, 2d Part, die Lehre vom Begriff*, p. 209. ‘The more the teleological principle has been connected with the notion of a supernatural understanding, and so far favoured by piety, the further has it appeared to depart from true natural philosophy, which sees in the properties of nature, not alien, but inherent certainties.’—P. 210. ‘The aim is the conception objectively realized.’—P. 219.

no more, as the head of a new world, in which nature will be glorified in the spirit, the spirit incorporate in nature. Thus Christ is the Alpha and Omega in the development of the world. Hence His appearance in the midst of time has a depth and significance including both the beginning and the end. If we contemplate the *eon* of the natural world of mankind, His life may be designated as the end of the world. But on this very account His life is equally the beginning of the world, the foundation of a new and eternal world of mankind. As the light, the power, the saving life, the sanctifying Spirit, Christ forms the centre of the world, a centre whose influences penetrate all its depths, till they break forth in brightness on all points of its circumference, till the triumphant banners of the divine-human life float upon all the battlements of creature life. The coming of the Son of man will be like a flash of lightning, shattering the Old World from east to west, and discovering the New World in its spiritual glory.

In every normal birth, the head first makes its appearance from the parent's womb. Therefore was the new, glorified, and spiritual humanity first born into the world in its Head. But the members follow the head. Therefore the external organism of Christ's Church struggles out of the obscurity of natural life, that it may exhibit in its completeness the phenomenon of the eternal life.

Spirit is in its very nature eternal. But life is, in its natural appearance, transitory. Hence man remains for a long time in holy hesitation between eternity and transitoriness, because he is at once a structure of nature and a spiritual being—a union of the two powers. But the Eternal Spirit must elevate his perishing nature into His own element, into the glory of eternal life. Christ fulfilled this appointment. By His victory He has changed this hesitation between time and eternity into the triumph of eternity. And by communicating His Spirit to His people, nature is ennobled and spiritualized in them and by them, and raised by means of His victorious resurrection to the eternal. Hence the Church of Christ has ever had the feeling and expectation of being near to eternity, because, filled with the principle of eternity, she is ever ripening with silent but powerful growth for eternity.

It is in the very nature of things, that the whole history of the world, before Christ, should, both in great and small matters, point to Him in the realm of ideal life, as well as work towards Him in the realm of actual life. In all those great and little affairs of the world which have essential reference to the climax of the future, to Christ, tendencies and preludes may be perceived, whose fulfilment is given in Christ. And thus is time fulfilled in Him. We see here both the yearning of humanity after God, that is, its craving after eternity; and the satisfaction of this yearning, namely, the manifestation of God as it gradually dawned upon rough and sinful human nature in the ecstatic visions of patriarchs and prophets, until the time of its full appearance came. The life of Christ is the manifestation of eternity in time, because it is the manifestation

of God Himself, because it forms the eternal centre of humanity, discloses and savingly restores the eternal destiny of mankind, and by its power transforms all nature into spirit. Christ came into the world from the Father, and therefore entered time from eternity. But then He left the world again to go to the Father. He will not, however, return alone, but with His people. He will raise them up to share His own exaltation, that is, out of time into eternity, into the spiritual life, whose light shows all times in every moment, all worlds in every place, all hearts in every heart, eternal, tranquil, solemn unity in all the changes of infinite variety.

NOTES.

1. When it is settled that time and space are no gods, it is at the same time decided that God is not limited by time and space, and is therefore not a developing (werdender) God. But not only God, but man also, as a being of divine extraction, is raised in his own nature above time and space. Even in his relation to time, man is as 'the happy one for whom no hour strikes,' not to mention his being, as a partaker of salvation, a timeless being, whose memory and hope are ever pointing out the flight by means of which he soars, eagle-like, above the temporal. He is in the essence of his nature above time. This characteristic of his inner nature is the natural basis of prophecy. The prophet passes above and beyond the present and the temporal, by means of the divine Spirit. In His light he beholds the future. But man can as little retreat from, as advance beyond the external present, without the co-operation of the Spirit. He cannot even appropriate history without His intervention. The very forms of language express this elevation of man above time. By the words : I was—he places himself in the past ; by the words : I shall be—in the future. The Greek Aorist especially expresses this hovering above time. With respect to his relation to space, man is comprised in an eternal tissue stretching into infinity ; hence the poetic attraction of the mind towards the blue distance. But in his renewal through the Spirit of God, he is a king, constantly obtaining a new purple from the treasury of the kingdom when the old has grown obsolete, and whose resurrection is pledged, by the power of his spiritual life over the visible world. Misconceptions of eternity, whose theological result is the destruction of the noblest dogmas, whose philosophical result is the destruction of the noblest ideas, are connected with misconceptions of personality. Thus time becomes an ever-produced line, never finding or exhibiting repose in the sacred circle of eternity ;¹ and finite being rushes breathlessly, in wild pursuit

¹ Natural history takes the exactly opposite course (to the ordinary view of nature). Nature is, in her view, originally only active. All nature is ever changing and ever changeable, and change itself, the only constancy. This original activity is the first and last, the primitive thesis, the ever-present and the eternal, the unchanged in the midst of change ; and, for those natural philosophers who would construct nature from it, the inherent creation of the world.'—Steffen's *Alt und Neu: Beurtheilung dreier naturphilosophischer Schriften Schellings*, p. 9.

and ever unsatisfied longings, through time and space to reach the infinite, but in vain ! But Christ has manifested the fulfilment of time, even eternity, by the power of His eternal nature. His peace is the peace of eternity, of personality merged in God and finding itself in God. In the power of that infinite superiority to time and space, which is part of His eternal nature, He threatens the storm and wind of that pantheistic excitement of the sea of life, whose wild and foaming obscurity threatens to overwhelm its disciples. And thus there is a great calm. The presence of the personal God gives to His people the assurance that they are eternal personalities, for whom the roaring flood of temporal life is to be transformed into the calm, transparent sea of His eternal administration.

2. Even Feuerbach is constrained to remark (in his essay *Das Wesen des Christenthums*), though he distorts even this truth into error, that in Christ the end of the natural world of men appeared in principle ; that He, as the beginner of a new world, represented the close of the old. ‘Christ, i.e., the historic religious Christ, is not the centre but the end of history. This follows as much from the conception of Christ as from history. Christians expected the end of the world, of history.’—P. 204. It is just because Christ is the principle of the heavenly, and the centre of the actual, that He is the end of the natural world of men.¹

SECTION V.

THE IDEALITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

Christianity is in perfect harmony with the conviction that God is the perfect, the all-comprehending, the all-pervading spirit, that He is the power ruling over all life, and that He shows Himself to be this power. God is light, and not darkness, not dull matter, not a being of an unspiritual and impenetrably obscure nature ; neither is there in Him a shadow of uncertainty. This conviction is a fundamental one in the conception of spirit ; and by it, pure Monotheism is superior to Heathenism, Moses to Plato, Genesis to all the sacred books of Paganism. It is in the life of Christ that its verification is celebrated ; for this life is the manifestation of the

¹ [The old and recently revived question, ‘utrum Christus venisset, si Adam non peccasset,’ is one which philosophical theology is required to face. If we speculate at all on the connection of God with the world, on His freedom and purpose in creating, we meet the question : whether or not the world, with all its vastness and order, is worthy of the infinite Creator ; whether it adequately expresses His perfections ; whether there was anything in His purpose, and therefore in the essential history of the world, which can be viewed as a worthy motive of His action. Many, feeling the difficulty of asserting that a finite production is worthy of the design of an infinite God, have adopted the solution that (as Malebranche says), ‘though man had never sinned, a divine Person would not have failed to unite Himself to the universe to give it an infinite dignity, so that God should receive a glory perfectly correspondent to His action.’ See the question fully treated in Dorner on the *Person of Christ*, Div. II. i. 361, &c., and very lucidly by Saisset, *Modern Pantheism*, i. 76, &c.—ED.]

identity of all reality and all ideality, the marriage festival of their union. It is the manifestation of God in the flesh.

Those great contrasts in human life, spirit, and appearance, the ideal and the actual, were originally one. Hence the life of the first man rightly appears in the light of its ideality. Man, at his first appearance, was good, the pure product of God's creative energy. He lived in the visible glory of the divine goodness which surrounded him, that is, in Paradise. In this point of view, he was not yet subject to temporality, he was not as yet of a perishable nature. He felt within himself that formative process which originated the world, and divined his antecedents with childlike intuitiveness. He felt the presence of God in the gentle whispers of the airs of Paradise, the decisions of God in the impressions made upon himself by the creatures. It was thus that he received a primitive revelation from the co-operation of the objects of surrounding nature with his own sensuous and spiritual powers of anticipation, in the all-enlightening element of the omnipresent divine Spirit. This primitive revelation was, therefore, essentially identical with his primitive condition. If it be represented as special, extraordinary, and supernatural, there is an unconscious assumption of the schism which did not as yet exist.¹ This is also the case when primitive man, in the bright dawn of his birth, comprising the beauty of the whole race, surrounded by creation celebrating his advent with joyful animation, when this man is exchanged for the savage in whom the universal curse appears in its full development, and who represents only a stunted branch of humanity.² This blessed condition, however, of primitive man was in its very nature only for a happy and pretemporal (*vorzeitlicher*) season.

Both moral and religious consciousness testify that the fall must have taken place. Man finds in his life a contradiction between his ideal duty and will, and between his sensuous, or rather his carnal, will and deed; a contradiction between his destiny and reality. Whence did this contradiction arise? By his deeming the restraint under which he was placed an evil, and fancying that he could

¹ In this manner does the Apostle Paul, Gal. iii. 19, 20, treat the difference between the Mosaic and the Christian religion. In the former, angels and mediators are employed; but a mediator presupposes a schism (*ἐνὸς οὐκ ἐστι*). In the latter, God gives Himself to man, becomes one with him in Christ; the schism, and with it the (mere) mediator, being done away (*ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἐστι*).

² Hegel, *Religionsphilosophie*, Pt. iii. p. 212: 'The state which has been foolishly supposed to have been the primitive one, the state of innocence, is the state of nature of the animal.' This is a merely naturalistic assertion, unable to conceive of man as a pure product of the Spirit of God, in the ideal pristine vigour of his primitive condition, because some degenerate corrupt branch of the human family is regarded as the type of primitive man. Could then the Greek, the Jew, the German, have been comprised in the savage as in the first Adam? If this original or natural existence is designated as an evil one, an Ahriman is introduced, against whom no Ormuzd could defend himself. [In conformity with Hegel's view of primitive man is the opinion of Strauss, that nothing more is required for the transition from Polytheism to Monotheism than an improved intellectual culture, and an increasing observation of the natural world. The theory of civilised man gradually developing from the savage has been thoroughly refuted by the late Archbishop Whately in a lecture entitled 'Civilisation.'—ED.]

remedy it.¹ For it was by this very means that, when once the contradiction existed, he fell ever farther and farther into the depths of opposition. The nature of the first sin may thus be inferred by the nature of the sin and sinfulness ever before our eyes. By this schism, man's stand-point with respect to the enlightenment of the Eternal Spirit has been entirely displaced. In his error, he first looks upon his sin as only a natural evil ; and, erring still further, he sees wrong even in natural evil. Nature now seems to him a defection from the ideal, an obscurity in God. Reality appears to him as a curse, as a judgment of God, ever plunging him into still lower depths. Thus he charges the contradiction between life and the ideal upon nature,—partly with justice, because even in nature his disturbing influence is apparent ; partly with injustice, because God rules in nature, and opposes his sin in all reality. This rupture between ideality and reality, which pervades his whole soul, threatens to become an ever-increasing abyss.

But the atonement to come, had its foundation in the original relation existing between divinity and humanity, as described above. In the work of atonement is manifested the reciprocal effect of the compassion of God and the yearning of man. Hence the course of divine pity must ever be in harmony with human desire, and thus also in harmony with divine justice. It was under this condition that the great preparation for the atonement arose.

It was necessary that the atonement should take place in and through humanity, for in and through it was the union between the ideal and the actual to reappear. But it was equally necessary that it should take place in separation from and above humanity, for it could only be effected as an act of God. All ideality is on His side, and has power over all reality ; but reality which appears in opposition to ideality is impotent, and without resource.

Hence the atoner, the reconciler, is on one hand the Son of man, the expression of the deepest and truest life of the human race. He belongs to it. On the other hand, He is the second man, given by God, filled with God. Hence He stands in separation from the first man, and, with him, from the whole race, as the Merciful One, the Redeemer.

This contrast appears in process of formation even in the preparation for the atonement. On one side is seen the religious man in his passivity ; in his development religion appears as the religion of nature, and under its prevalence human ruin comes to maturity, to that universal despair in which the need of redemption attains its full growth. On the other side, the religious man appears in his activity ; spiritual religion is the path taken by his activity, and its climax and fruit is the God-man, the actual and true atonement.

This is the contrast between Judaism and Heathenism. God

¹ They who consider the first sin necessary to the spiritual development of man, must consequently prolong the continuance of sin to eternity. This particular error is, however, connected with the more general one of viewing the determinative merely as the negative, and failing to recognise the positive in the negative.

suffered the heathen to walk in their own ways, the ways of vanity, in opposition to the eternal ways of the Spirit. He withdrew from them, as they withdrew from Him. But He called Abraham and his descendants; and His call met their faith and prayer. They who misconceive this contrast, or find it inconsistent with the justice of God, who require an abstract equality in God's dealings with all nations, might as well take offence at the fact that God did not give the Iliad to the Hottentots, nor the fair hair of the ancient Germans and the Niebelungenlied to the Esquimaux.¹

This contrast, however, is only a contrast, and not a contradiction; that is to say, that the salvation which came through the Jews had an inward and hidden reference to the craving for salvation which was ripening among the heathen. It was, moreover, only a limited contrast: notwithstanding the general tendencies of the heathen nations, the need of salvation was urgently felt by the majority,² and this feeling was itself a near approximation to salvation; while in the majority of the Jews, in spite of the fact that salvation had ripened in their midst, an immense estrangement from salvation had been developed, just because they wanted to convert the contrast into a contradiction—their nation absolutely saved, other nations absolutely lost.³ Consequently, if national developments in general are taken into account, the contrast is entirely a relative one. There is a reflection of spiritual religion in the development of natural religion, as well as a reflection of natural in spiritual religion.

Heathenism, absolutely considered, is the contrast between the ideal and the actual. But heathenism, elevated by the feature of aspiration, and of the divine Spirit, displays a mutual interweaving of the ideal into life and of life into the ideal. An element of aspiration existed, which invested the non-historical ideal with an

¹ Eichhorn agrees with the Fragmentists* in refusing to recognise an immediate divine agency, at least in the Old Testament history of the world. The mythological researches of a Heyne had already so far enlarged his circle of vision as to lead him to perceive how such an influence must be either admitted or denied in the primitive histories of all people.—Strauss, *Leb. Jesu*, Pt. i. p. 20.

² [Very interesting corroborations in detail of this whole chapter, and especially of this point, are to be found in the works of Gale, Bryant, Döllinger, Pressensé, and Ackerman, or in a still more accessible form in Trench's *Hulsean Lectures*, and summarily in Bushnell's *Nature and the Supernatural*, chap. viii.—ED.]

³ The Jewish point of view, opposed by St Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, is the same which is expressed in the question, Why should the Jews alone have been favoured with the blessing of revelation? The Jews inquired, Why should salvation come to the Gentiles, and not to the Jews alone? But we have to deal here, not with merely dogmatical assertions, but with facts which only the deluded deny. The lightning darts through the clouds in a zigzag direction, and in like manner does the spirit of revelation dart through the world. The one phenomenon arises from the extreme rarity of the lightning, shown by its floating between the attracting forces, and the other from the infinite discrimination of the Spirit, who in His righteousness passes through the world with constant reference to the attraction of a felt need of salvation.

* ['The Fragmentists,' i.e., those who adopt the opinions broached in the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*, published by Lessing in the year 1777, in the fourth number of the 'Contributions to History and Literature from the Treasures of the Ducal Library at Wolfenbüttel,' in which an anonymous writer attacked the Christian religion, and especially the history of the resurrection. Lessing disclaimed some of the sentiments there uttered—especially stating that no difference in the accounts of the resurrection could disprove the fact.—ED.]

historical body, and the mere dull fact with an ideal splendour and a divine significance. It was thus that mythology, viewed on its bright side, was developed. For it has its dark side also, and lies under the influence of general heathen corruption. We are now, however, considering it only in its more exalted aspect. The myth-forming element, then, is in general identical with the element of aspiration after the reconciliation of the ideal and the actual, after the God-man. It is the play, the anticipation, the poetry, the dream of the christological propensity in its passivity. When, then, this aspiring poetical spirit seizes on the ideal, or the theorem to which in heathenism the power of reality is wanting, it bestows upon them, by a gradual process of contemplation and illustration, more and more of an historic body, and forms them into facts. And thus philosophic myths arise from the element of unconscious longings for the incarnation of God, for heavenly reality. But the same spirit applies itself still more readily to such actual facts or natural phenomena as have a higher significance, explaining them according to its presentiment that all reality must be penetrated by spiritual light. Thus arise historical myths, completed by physical ones, and proceeding from a desire for the glorification of the flesh.¹ And finally, when suffering man seeks repose from his weary lot in the charms of poetry, and indulges in anticipations of a brighter and better future, he unites historical and philosophical myths into new forms, in which the whole actual world shines with divine splendour, and heaven is communicated to earth in a circle of facts. Thus do poetic myths arise.

The myth-forming era of a nation terminates as well as its infancy. But when does this take place? It may be answered, When its infancy ceases, when it begins to write, or something similar. But such answers are unsatisfactory.

When the mind of a nation begins to reflect, and to perceive the fearful depth of the abyss existing between the ideal and life, its myth-forming activity must needs be extinguished. But together with this perception, and in the same proportion, will that hitherto hidden ideal, the government of God, dawn upon it in its strict historical reality. And thus also will it learn to appreciate the spiritual actuality present in the ideals and axioms of the theory of life. Its poetry now becomes the poetry of reality, contemplating and illustrating the actual by the light of philosophical attainments, in its relation to the eternal. The transition, however, from the mythic to the historic stage is by no means a sudden one. It is but gradually that the national mind begins to find even in human

¹ When Eve, in her aspirations after the ideal, exclaimed at the birth of her first son, I have gotten the man, the Lord (Gen. iv. 1), the myth-forming instinct, the instinct of glorifying the actual in the ideal of the divine-human life, was strikingly displayed. The words קָנָהּ אִישׁ אֶת־יְהוָה have indeed been otherwise translated; but, in any case, they represent man in intimate inward relation to Jehovah, the Lord, and therefore man in his ideality. And this is the matter in question. Comp. Baumgarten, *theol. Kommentar zum Pentateuch*, Pt. i. p. 74.

caprice, in the accidental, in the bright and the dark sides of life and of nature, and especially in the demoniacal, a more general significance, viz., its relation to the eternal ; and thus legends arise. In tradition, the ideal of general reality begins to disclose itself to man. Legends must therefore be of three kinds. Historical legends may perhaps convert the first natural philosophers into powerful magicians ; philosophic legends may transform the sportive and evanescent beauties of nature into charming elves, and represent the temptations and deliverances of man as the victories of his guardian spirit over the evil spirits ; while poetic legends will blend together reminiscences, for instance, of some demoniacally powerful Dr Faust, with legends of the demoniacal and Faust-like spirit in the breast of man, into a most powerful and effective poem. It is by means of the legend that man is led from that state of childhood and childlike presentiment, whose propensity it is to form myths from the historic germ of the ideal, and from the ideal germ of significant facts, to conscious life, which clearly perceives and carries out the difference between the ideal and life, between poetry and reality, and begins to seek for the divine in things as they are.

The philosophic myth now becomes philosophy. The heathen national mind, having come to maturity, now seeks the divine in philosophy as the theory of life, and in order to find it in this abstraction, distinguishes between the school and the life, speculative spirits and ordinary individuals, and proceeds from system to system. The result is despair, for the ideal is never fully realized in life. The elect of speculative blessedness abandon the uninitiated to gloomy ignorance ; one system supersedes another, and scepticism threatens to swallow up all. But despair itself brings forth the seed of the felt necessity of salvation. The logos of Plato might animate, civilize, and embellish the world, but could neither make, save, nor sanctify it. The stoicism of Zeno could sacrifice everything, but only in proud self-will, not in the love of God. The recognition of nature's subjection to law could point Epicurus to a peace to be attained by a conduct in entire conformity with the state of life, but could not lead to rest and delight in God. These ideals formed no unity : they had no power over the life, they were not themselves manifested in the flesh ; but they prepared the best of the heathen, by the deep despondency they evoked, the anticipations they inspired, and the prefigurations they taught, for the recognition of the manifestation in the flesh. Parallel also with philosophy appeared the cultivation of actual history, removing with ever-increasing strictness the embellishments of fiction, and seeking the ideal, the overruling providence of God, in historic reality ; in the curse of civil war, as well as in the triumph of courageous patriotism ; in the pestilence which raged among the people, as well as in the songs of victory which gladdened their festivals ; in the silent intelligent connection and concatenation of events, as well as in the terrible judgments in which retribution is seen to march

with avenging steps. But here also the result was despair,—a despair, however, which, with unconscious hope, tremblingly discerned the sublime proceedings of the Judge, and produced the fruit of a submission which cast itself upon that Judge's mercy.

The poetic myth now appeared in its metamorphosed and matured form, as classic poetry and formative art. In plastic art, the beautiful forms of gods in human shape are the most significant productions, the faint images of an incarnation of God. The Greek possessed images of special aspects or incidents of the incarnation, but not of the mere incarnation. For the image of Zeus differed from the image of Apollo, and this again from the image of Minerva, and so forth. There is no more a unity of forms in art, than there is a unity of ideals in philosophy. Nothing but a monstrous prejudice could elevate these abstractions or fragmentary ruins of the ideal, of the God-man, exhibited by the pale, cold marble images, which could but point to the divine humanity, above the more hidden, but more spiritual, the glowing, living, and real process of formation of the God-man, of Immanuel, in the prophetic life of Israel.¹ It is in heathen poetry, however, that we find the greatest abundance of christological aspirations. In epic poetry, gods, heroes, and men are mingled in the greatest variety. This is the heathen counterpart of the monotheistic ladder reaching to heaven, upon which the angels of God ascend and descend. In lyric poetry are found strains in sympathy with that repose of the human heart in the ideal which became real, permanent, and true in Christ. But it is dramatic poetry which is most significant. It exhibits subjective human personality and action in their struggle with, and opposition to, the power of the reality which God directs and permits. In the comic drama appears that meaner kind of folly which history cannot depict; it is forthwith exposed to ridicule by the power of reality, and the mirth of comedy denotes the constant sinking of the bubbles and froth of vanity in the general stream of rational and moral life. In tragic poetry we witness crime obtaining historical importance by its dark power, and continuing to entail results, until, either as the guilt of the individual, or as the hereditary guilt of the family involved in its curse, it brings about the catastrophe which requires a sacrifice, and which, viewed as a judgment of Supreme Justice, breathes of atonement. It is in Greek tragedy, then, that we meet with the deepest christological notions ever attained by the heathen world. An Iphigenia 'who must die that an Helen may be recovered'; an Antigone who sacrifices her happiness and life to redeem her brother's soul;—what significant references are these to the great centre, the real, the universal, the sufficient atonement! There is a hundred times more unconscious feeling for the truth of the Christian doctrine of the atonement, both in pure ancient tragedy, and in the nobler products of modern tragedy, than in many hypocritical rationalistic moral sermons, based as they are upon a conceited and narrow-

¹ See Hegel's *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion*, Pt. ii. pp. 79, 80, &c.

minded dislike to the doctrine that Christ atoned on the cross for the sins of Adam's race. But tragedy being, as classic poetry, distinct from actual life, could at best but mature the aspiration after the true atonement and the sense of its need, and increase the susceptibility for its reception.

The national development of the fall of man among the heathen nations, stood from the first in contrast with the national development of salvation among the Jews. Salvation in its formative process exhibits from the beginning an actual realization of the divine ideal of humanity, or, in other words, the idealization of humanity in its inmost actual tendencies. In discussing the call of Abraham, it is a wholly false and no longer tenable alternative, so to view the matter as to consider it a question between the actings of his own mind alone, or the supernatural acts of God alone. That harmonious contrast which exhibits the human in the divine, and the divine in the human, is more in keeping here. The EITHER and OR which would for ever separate divinity and humanity, are quite out of date in this case. Divine as well as human is the ~~solution~~ throughout. It would betray a great want of appreciation of the divine-human life to be still disputing concerning Christian faith, whether it were the work of God or of man. Even in the very first germination of the christological life in the patriarchs, this ardent and inward interaction takes place. Because God seeks man, man seeks God, and *vice versa*. God calling man, and man calling on God, meet and lay hold upon each other. The God who calls, enters unto covenant with the man who calls upon Him. By this covenant with Jehovah, with the ever-personal God of ever-personal beings, the life of the patriarchs begins to shine with the glory of the ideal. The dawn of the manifestation of God in the flesh appears. The religion of Israel, as the religion of the patriarchs, or of the promise, is the counterpart of the heathen mythology. The promise is divine ideality realized, or in process of realization, in its interaction with the active aspirations of men freely yielding themselves to God. If historic myths are here sought, the seekers are corrected by the appearance of Abraham, who, in strict historical reality, is declared to be, in spite of all deficiencies, through faith, the father of the faithful. Are philosophic myths inquired after?—the inquiry is met by the history of Jacob, appearing as Israel, and showing how the Ideal becomes Life: he so wrestled with the angel of the Theophany, during the darkness of the night, that he was lamed by the shock, and went halting in the daylight. Finally, are poetic myths sought?—these, as well as the two former kinds, are superseded and forbidden by more real relations; in the blessing of Jacob, e.g., appears a poem prophetically disclosing the very spirit and significance of his sons, and the theocratic future of his descendants.

The counterpart of heathen legends is seen among the people of Israel in the rich significance acquired by everything emerging from this people, or even coming in contact with them. The Dead

Sea, Saul among the prophets, the Edomite, and Philistine, all become symbolical when viewed in the light of the Israelitish mind.

But here also the masculine pre-Christian consciousness is characterized by its discrimination of the various references between the real and the ideal. Heathen philosophy finds its counterpart in the law of the Hebrews. If the ideal is mere theory in the former, it becomes statute and practice in the latter. If it forms an esoteric school in the former, it forms an exoteric national society in the latter. If in the former it wanders from system to system, it exhibits itself in the latter in the firmest historical consistency. From the fact, indeed, that the ideal becomes law for a whole nation, with all its rough, weak, and wild members, it seems to lose in logical pliability and pure spirituality. But the law in Israel, which was binding upon all spirits, was completed by the typical worship, which stirred, awakened, instructed, and liberated those that were receptive. All the types of this worship were, to the receptive, symbols of the eternal thoughts of God, and awoke within them ever increasing anticipations, as well as isolated perceptions and glimpses, of the nature of the atonement.

With the actual history, too, of the heathen nations, and its exhibition of tragic objective reality, is contrasted the sacred history of Israel, with its reference of all the events and leadings experienced by the people of God to His direct appointment. The history of Israel is illuminated by the glory of the ideal. The stars are in alliance with the host of the Lord. The phenomena of natural life are seen in co-operation and harmony with the antecedents and circumstances of the kingdom of God. All the great incidents even of profane history are, by their reference to the higher life in Israel, placed in relationship with the supreme and universal aim and purpose, with the manifestation of God, with the atonement. From this explanation of the ways of Israel arises that rich historical typicism, by which God's dealings with Israel—*e.g.*, their passage through the Red Sea, and their wanderings in the wilderness—typify the lot of His true people.

Finally, the noblest manifestation of spiritual life among the heathen, *viz.*, art and poetry, finds its counterpart in Hebrew prophecy. In the former, the poet is an idealistic prophet; in the latter, the prophet is a realistic poet. In the one, we have a passive homage done to that holy thing which was in process of formation; in the other, the active formation of the object of sacred homage. In the inspired frames and utterances of the prophets are represented the incidents of the maturing and approaching incarnation of the Son of God. Poetry itself is filled with the power of reality, and reality is laid hold of, corrected, cheered, and penetrated by this consecrating spirit. This struggle of humanity with divinity, and of divinity with humanity, which, with its overflowing joys and abundant sorrows, forms the distinctive characteristic of Israelitish life, terminates at last in their perfect union in

the God-man.¹ The holy Virgin, the highly favoured instrument of mature, perfect, human aspiration, conceives the God-man, the incarnation of complete salvation, and now reality becomes ideality, and ideality reality,—the true union of divinity and humanity appears.

But till this consummation, the eternal light, during the process of its breaking forth from behind the dark background of the natural national life of Israel, was surrounded by coloured rims, representing in mythological reflections the myths of the heathen world. The patriarchs had their imperfections, the law its transitory forms, the history of Israel its strange admixtures, the prophets their troubled frames of mind, and the opposition of false prophets. Hence a mythological excrescence forms as it were the setting to the development of pure theocracy in Israel, but is always separate and distinct, as a mere accompaniment, from the brightness of this development. At length, with the consummation of the ideal reality, a positive heathen product of this mythological matter is formed in Israel. Abstract myths of the New Testament era are represented by the deeds of hardened and antichristian Judaism; philosophical myths, by the Talmud; historical myths, by the homeless journeying of the wandering Jew through the world; poetic myths, by the lamentations of Israel over the mere shadow of Zion's glory, when its reality was ever more and more giving light to the world. Before endeavouring to form an estimate of the genuine ideal history of the incarnation of God in Christ in its full significance, we will try to depict the relation of the more prominent features of the world's history in the ages subsequent to the Christian era, during which the effects of Christ's life were developed, to the mythology of ancient times.

In the Christian world, history was essentially modified. It was now subjected to the ever-increasing preponderance of the ideal over the actual. The divine life now flowed, like a silent but mighty stream, through the world of men. The most wonderful, the most exalted ideals became realities; *e.g.*, the emancipation of slaves, the moral and intellectual equality of woman with man, the recognition of the brotherhood of nations, and their incipient alliance. But the history of the world in Christian times did not become immediately an entirely ideal history. The power of old corruptions, though it had received its death-blow, continued to manifest a fearful activity; and this still active corruption appeared in its universal prevalence even within the circle of the Church, so soon as the Church ventured to receive into its bosom, by wholesale baptisms, nations which had yet to be educated into Christian nations. But the spirit of Christianity, assured beforehand of victory, nay, animated by present victory, as the spirit of Christ, was ever contending with these masses of rude and corrupt reality. It is from these fundamental relations of the Eternal Spirit to reality, that isolated analogies have arisen between Christian his-

¹ Gen. xxxii. 24, &c.

tory and the Jewish and heathen histories, with reference to the mythological notion.

The life of the Church of Christ is in its essence divine and human, glorious, spiritually active, in other words, at once both real and ideal. Such a life flows with ever increasing power through the hidden depths of Church history ; and in these depths the Christian spirit and Christian reality, as well as Christian poetry, or the celebration of life's ideal, are one. In its development, however, the life of Christ in the Church is a life in process of formation, and more or less resembles the Israelitish life. The characteristic of this formative process was seen in the fact, that Christian truths, like laws, tended to life, but had not yet become free and developed life ; that Christian persons, ways, and facts, though everywhere illumined by the heavenly glory of the ideal, were frequently plunged again into darkness ; that Christian worship was still in strong contrast with work, Sundays with working days, poetry with actual life. This circle of formative Christian life, however, was itself surrounded by an extensive circle of heathen life, which the nations had in large proportions transplanted into the Christian Church. In this dark surrounding, even the light of Christianity was of necessity variously refracted, and the deepest dyes and loudest tones of the ancient mythology in consequence reappeared. The time of Christ and of His apostles may be compared with the time of the patriarchs. Our remarks will eventually treat of this period, but are at present more immediately concerned with periods of greater historical breadth, more comprehensible, and gradually leading to the due understanding of that ideal height.

The age of the apostolic fathers and of apostolic traditions till the time of Constantine, may be compared with that age of legends which forms the transition from the mythologic to the historic period. An addition of the mythic element plays round the centre of purely Christian and spiritualized reality. In the systems of the Gnostics, the plastic impulse of Christianity appears in its strangest form. Every notion here appears as an acting person. As a semi-heathen tendency, Gnosticism recoils from acknowledging the Incarnate Word, the God-man ; while as a semi-Christian tendency, it is constrained to satisfy its impulse towards the one true God-man by the formation of a thousand idealistic phantoms of Him. And thus philosophic legends make their appearance. The historic are exhibited in the manner in which the important personages of the time are symbolically magnified : Nero, *e.g.*, into the Antichrist ; Simon Magus, the spurious miracle-worker, into the counterpart of Simon Peter. Antichristian life also is drawn in darker, and Christian life in fairer colours, than the facts justify, as in the history of the martyrs. It is in the apocryphal gospels and histories of apostles, however, that the poetic legends of the period, the pious romances of this very peculiar popular life, appear. For there were but few whose primary intention, as heretical works, was actual deception.

The period from Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great, forcibly recalls that of the giving of the law to Israel. The sacred ideal now becomes symbol, as it then became law. Religious history now becomes a history of dogmas, as then a typical history. Then, popular poetry was the celebration of symbolical promises ; here, it is the commemoration of the perfected fact of redemption. The mythic element here appears in large proportions as an accessory. The Son of God of the Arians, for instance, is a philosophical myth in process of formation, gradually introducing by its development a new Polytheism. The history of the first monks, *e.g.*, of Anthony and Paul of Thebes, forms historic myths of the most beautiful and fullest significance. The tradition of this period becomes poetry, its poetry tradition, and the poetic myth is seen in the very dawn of legendary fiction.

The middle ages exhibit the New Testament people of God in their greatest extension, in their first stage of Christian development, at their nearest approach to heathenism. All forms of spiritual life, Christian, Jewish, heathen, are here present, and the most various, the most copious intermixture of the real with the ideal takes place : there is a continual advance of heathenism by the law and the promise towards Christ, a continual descent of the Christian spirit upon all the steps of this wide-spread and various national temperament. If we inquire after the ideal in its Christian vitality, after doctrine, Scholasticism exhibits a remarkable embodiment of all ideal Christian knowledge. Scholasticism is Christian in its essence—freedom of thought in the power of faith ; Old Testament-like in its form—its defined and statutory decisions, and in the relation of service in which it stands to ecclesiastical dogmas ; and finally, mythologic in the manner in which it converts separate notions into definite forms, and is reflected in the abhorrent astonishment of Christian people. Yet how marvellously did the enthusiasm of the Christian ideal seize the Christian nations of the middle ages ! The whole life of mediæval times becomes romantic, that is, illuminated by the lightning-like glances of the Eternal, pervaded by touches of significant symbolism, through the attraction of Christian enthusiasm, in its popular, sympathetic power, and in the impulsive ardour of its youth. As the lightning at night continually illuminates the dark sky, so do the day-streaks of the Eternal fall, with ever increasing brightness, upon the dark reality. Life itself becomes poetry in this idealistic tendency. The Grecian people, in the ideal expedition of its heroic and youthful period, the expedition to Troy, obtained possession of the beautiful woman ; the Jewish people, in an expedition of a similar kind, according to their temperament and tendency, conquered the promised land ; the Christian nations, in their romantic expeditions, delivered the holy sepulchre. These all expressed the peculiarity of their several tendencies, temperaments, and enthusiasms, in relation to an historical phenomenon, which they recognized as their most special property, and which became to them the symbol of

their whole spiritual prosperity. But when we contemplate the distinctive incidents of this idealized Christian national history, we see that in the deep clostral seclusion of monastic life, in the middle ages, the Christian spirit, as such, was diving with mystic ardour into the mysteries of the Gospel, and converting them into experience and knowledge ; that, besides an external sacerdotal consecration, it was acquainted with the free consecration of the Spirit in the various stages of the inner life, and was thus preparing for that happy New Testament life of faith which broke forth at the Reformation. We see, however, the same spirit in its Old Testament form, as a theocratic spirit, agitating and exciting, educating and consecrating, national life ; we see it as a legal spirit, wielding the rod, or even hurling the threatening and annihilating lightning ; we see it as a presentient spirit, converting all persons, customs, usages, and events into symbols of the future and eternal world. The heathen mind also everywhere takes its part in transforming Christian history into mythic phantasmagoriae, Christian apophthegms into heathen incantations, Christian relics into heathen fetishes, Christian saints into heathen divinities. As then this Christian national life is itself romantic, the poetry and art of the period are especially so. It is not enough that these should produce their proper effect as art, they must be also symbolic and prophetic. Thus related to Christian idealism, and illuminated by it, do we behold mediæval art seizing upon history, and consecrating it by the worship with which she is identified. This symbolic kind of poetry and art of the middle ages unites the enigmatic typicism of the Old Testament with that Christian transparency of form which allows the light of the ideal to be seen ; while, under the form of legends, it expresses, in a manner more or less mythological, the great gulf between the Christian ideal and reality. With the Reformation, however, Christian national life, as such, began to rise to the spiritual level of the New Testament, the specific distinction between the priesthood and the laity being, in conformity with the spirit of Christianity, abolished. The dogmas of Christianity, which had hitherto been regarded as a kind of esoteric mysteries, unfitted for and unattainable by the ordinary understanding of the Christian people, being now inculcated in a manner suited to the intellectual capacities of the flock, were transformed into powerful convictions and vital influences. On the other hand, all life, all reality, was brought to light and to judgment by the purifying glow of the Christian spirit : morals, trade, policy, war, all were thrown into the refining fire, and only that which was pure could abide the flames, and exhibit an ideal reality. Hence, too, past history was viewed more and more in its relation to the destiny of man, and explained in its ideality as the effect of the all-prevailing government of God. And finally, poetry also became more abundant in vitality, a consecration of man's deepest sorrows, questions, hopes, and blessings ; and true Christian life acquired more and more the transfiguration glory resulting from a solemn

contemplation of all worldly events in the light of Christ's victory. Thus a prospect was opened of a future, in which all Christian ideals will have the power of all availing vital forces, of custom and reality; and in which Christian national life will appear in the consecration of the Spirit, in the priestly dignity of continual submission to God, and in the royal honour of free agency, in His strength. The result of this union of the divine and human life in the great extension of elect Christian national life, will be the perfected poetry of life, the longed-for rest of the people of God, called by the Mystics the seventh era, the Sabbath of the world's history.

In proportion, however, as this ideal Christian history comes to maturity, and even more speedily, is its antichristian contrast also matured, the last universal form of that false mythological manner of existence which, in the presence of apostolic Christianity, was formed in the Talmud, and in the allied features of Judaism. On one hand, it announced itself by the philosophical tendency which denied to the ideal the power of being realized in the personality of the God-man, in the Christian Church, in its priesthood, in immortal individuals, and their salvation. On the other hand, it profaned history: moral precepts were to supplant religious revelations, mechanical inventions to eclipse moral precepts, materialistic calculations to subjugate mechanical inventions, and, finally, animal inclinations were, as a fixed principle, to govern the whole human race. One result of this depreciation of the religious and ethical view of the world, was the appearance of an absolute scepticism in all that is historically noble or holy, since the certainty of the noble and the holy can only be recognized in the element of religion and morality. Finally, the poetry of this dismemberment of the world became, in conformity with this tendency, more and more a poetry of sin and crime, the poetry which glorifies man as the demoniac animal, but blasphemes the God-man. This development points to its termination, these appearances point to that final form wherein the ruin of mankind will be manifested in the maturity of its antichristian position. The dark side of mythology in its full development is seen here. Its hatred of the manifestation of ideal perfection in the light of Christianity, possessing as it does the illumination of that word which embraces and explains both heaven and earth, is shown in those strange caricatures and imitations of the ideal, in those monstrous representations of the spiritual, in which the apophthegm and its contradiction, prayer and blasphemy, the features of an angel of light and the grimaces of Satan, mingling with each other, exhibit the unspeakable confusion of the ideal. Aversion to Christian sanctity of life, as exhibited in the spiritual purity of marriage, in the spiritual consecration of property, in the spiritual elevation of the State, in the spiritual authority of the Church, which represents the bride,—this aversion has, in its delusions, so mingled the utmost profligacy with the most hypocritical monkery, the plunder of property with its dissipation, rebellion with

despotic terror, and scepticism with the most abject submission to the hierarchy, that the historical presence of this sanctity can nowhere be perceived or secured in this wild confusion, but passes through the bright day like a dark myth. The poetry of so confused a state of existence can, in its very nature, be no nightingale-song, but rather resembles the croak of the three demoniacal frogs of the Apocalypse (Rev. xvi. 13), who are to appear in the last stage of the world's history, to complete the last seduction. But everywhere, even in his deepest ruin, man testifies to the indestructible tendency of his life, to realize the ideal, to idealize the real, and to celebrate this union in poetry. Even mature Anti-christianity desires this union and its celebration, but not so that things should be absorbed in persons, but persons in things—not by investing substance with the light of the subject, but by plunging the subject into the obscurity of substance—not in the personal Christ, in whom all Christians are one, but in impersonal Christians, in whom the one Christ, ever divided and never complete, appears and disappears everywhere, and nowhere. Antichristianity is a caricature, a hostile imitation of Christianity, only because it wants personality, and especially the all-unifying person of Christ. All its distortions cry out for a total correction, all its perplexities for a thorough solution, all its mad phrases for a healing inspiration by one word, which would make all clear, the reigning person, the God-man.

But when we behold the full, ever-spreading, ever-increasing flow of Christian divine-human life through the world, and trace this stream to its origin, shall we find it to have its rise from a source in which the ideal has not become life, nor the life ideal—in which religious passivity, as in heathen mythology, must supply its deficiencies by fictions of an atonement? The stream, on the contrary, points to a source of its own kind, to an abundant and ever-flowing fountain of its own peculiar nature,—an origin, therefore, which is at once both spirit and fact, life and consecration. Christianity points back to Christ in all His historical glory.

Finally, if we follow the track of the christological formative process in the Old Covenant, and ask, To what end does it tend, what flower must this wondrous plant bear, into what fruit will it ripen?—this formative process also leads us to the appearing of Messiah, of the God-man in all His historical power and glory.

There must then necessarily exist between these pre-Christian preparations and that historical flowing forth of the divine-human life in the Christian era, such an upland as the Gospel history exhibits. The chief feature of this region is that fundamental principle of Christian life—atonement. Here, then, we see in highest religious activity that foreordained and perfected reality of divine life, to which heathen mythology testified in religious passivity by significant dreams. The beautiful dream has here grown into reality; hence that faint dream of a dream, the view

that the evangelical history has a mythic character, is an anachronism.

We have now reached that point of our subject which makes it our next concern to endeavour to estimate the nature of Christ Himself, with reference to the epochs of mythology. His advent as the God-man was necessary, as the result of Judaism, and as the principle of Christianity. If He had not so appeared, Judaism would be justified in its permanence ; and if He were not the personal God-man, the Christian life would be but a delusion, founded as it is on the relations of believing persons to the supreme personality. He is the Son of God : as the living unity of all the revelations of God, He appears with the power of eternity in the midst of time, and is thus also the complete realization of every divine ideal. But He is therefore also the Son of man, the living unity of all pure and elevated human life, the most intensely human being in the light of a holy life ; in other words, the perfect spiritualization of human reality. As the Son of God, He feels Himself, in virtue of His divine consciousness, to be resting in the bosom of the Father (John i. 18) ; and as the Son of man, he bears on His heart the whole human race, and strives to raise them with Himself into His glory (John xii. 32). Atonement is the central point of His being : in Him divinity and humanity, the spirit and nature, ideality and reality, Jews and Gentiles, heaven and earth, are reunited. We may now view His life in its various relations. When we see how the Godhead is therein manifested in the flesh, in other words, the Eternal in the highest historical reality, Christ is Himself presented to us as the supreme miracle, the vital principle of each separate miracle. He enters the already existing spheres of life, as the last, the decisive, the transforming vital principle ; hence He is both *the* miracle and the source of miracles, the principle of transformation and renewal to the whole Adamic race. But when we view His humanity, and see how it is one with its ideal, illuminated by the thought of God, and thus a reflection of the whole world, He appears also as the great symbol. He is in this relation the pure image of God, and therefore the light of the world ; the key which unlocks the spiritual riches of heaven, of mankind, and of nature ; the centre of all symbols. And because it is in Him that the Godhead first triumphs in complete victory in a human heart, and in Him that a human being first reposes on the bosom of God, on His Father's heart, and there joyfully rests and solemnly works, His life is the highest poetry. His dealings are the perfect rhythm ; His word is lyric, a perpetual hymn of praise ; His work the true worship of the highest festival, Himself the fairest of the children of men. And as Christ, as *the* miracle, renews the world, and as *the* symbol enlightens it ; so does He, as the fairest image of God therein, also glorify it, till His Church shall appear as the bride, till both heaven and earth shall crown her with splendour as the inheritance of God.

The glory of Christ's deeds is the result of this glory of His

nature.¹ As being in Himself *wonderful*, He must needs show Himself to be such, by wonder-working. Some would view Him as the God-man, without acknowledging His miracles ; others will concede the miracle of the resurrection, but none other. What is this but a sun without rays—a heaven-reaching alpine peak without its surrounding wreath of Alps, and without highlands ! The concession is as obscure as the negation. The incarnation of the Son of God is not His mere incorporation. In His incarnation is involved His dwelling and walking among men (John i. 14). For a man is converted into a mere apparition, if we do not grant that we must act in conformity with his intrinsic nature. This monstrous assumption is contrary also to historical truth and teleology. For never yet was a solitary power placed in the world, as a mere specimen, and then withdrawn. If it be said, that surely it is enough to allow that Christ effected very much by the power of His word, and founded an enduring Church, we would reply : Must not the auspices under which His powerful word formed the Church have been miracles ? Must not that effect of His word which, breaking through the outward forms of Judaism, in a few years transformed the Jewish world into the Christian world, have been accompanied by miraculous phenomena ? But if it is asserted that these miracles of the Lord Jesus were, at least when compared with His teaching, but subordinate manifestations of His life, such a view is certainly not that of St John, nor in accordance with the sublimity of the Christian principle. The Christian principle presupposes that in the life of Jesus every utterance has the power of a fact, every fact or miraculous operation the distinctness of a vocal declaration. Hence, according to St John's Gospel, our Lord often describes His word as His work ; His spiritual revelations consist of the most decided effects, they are the deeds of His word, or the words of His deed ; if at one time an act is the motive of His words, at another His word is the motive of His acts. Thus the words and works of Christ are, on the one hand, the separate miracles flowing from the deep fountain of His wondrous life ; on the other, the separate symbols, by which the varied and abundant affluence of the eternal Spirit is announced.²

¹ So-called 'Criticism' has committed itself to the absurdity of asserting that the leading events of the Gospel history were invented by the Evangelists. At one time, it is denied that Christ formed the Evangelists, and it is said that the general cannot be expressed in the particular ; at another, the Evangelist is said to have formed his Christ, and it is asserted that the general can only be expressed by the particular. According to Jean Paul's humorous narrative, a poor schoolmaster once composed a Klopstock's Messiah and other works, according to his own idea. It was thus, perhaps, that the Evangelist composed his Messiah, or if it were not the Evangelist who embellished his Master, it must have been the Church that did so. A new doctrine indeed, according to which the needy bride clothes the rich King with the robe of righteousness.

² According to modern criticism, traces of fiction may be recognized in the significant, the ideal. The reality of a fact is said to vanish before the illumination of the religious idea. What a reality is it which these critics require ! The more trivial and unspiritual, so much the more probable. In such a case, a witch would be more probable than a well-educated woman. And yet these histories of miracles, which at

What solemn beauty do all His deeds exhibit! A Sabbath glory rests on Canaan, where they were performed; a stream of eternal peace wells forth from His most arduous conflict in Gethsemane; the accursed tree itself becomes a mark of honour when once His holy head has touched it. This remark leads us to a fresh subject, that of the circumstances by which our Lord was surrounded. We are here reminded that it is legend which first strives to look upon coarse or common reality in the light of the ideal; that it is legend which grasps, by anticipation and invention, the spiritual significance of the actual world. But in this case fictions would be out of date. For it is a universal law that, as is the man, so is the opportunity presented to him. Supreme importance of personality demands supreme importance of surrounding circumstances. Hence the circumstances by which Christ was surrounded acquire a peculiar and universal distinction, as being adapted to call forth the full development of His power, to occasion the whole working out of His life. They form, in their character and concatenations, a concentrated expression of the history of the world. For it was in His own age that Christ overcame the world and the powers of hell; it was in His own days that He found appropriate instruments for the founding of His kingdom. Thus His history was perfected by the interaction of His peculiar life with a peculiar constellation of the world's history. And it is in this way that the ideality of His life becomes an illuminating agency to the whole world; on this account, that His fate is as wonderful as His life. The fact that the theocratically-trained Jewish world and the classically-trained heathen world united with equal perversion to crucify Him, exhibits a peculiar and tragical coincidence, involving the whole ancient world in condemnation. The world's sentence, which He underwent in His death, was to be followed by His resurrection. But if the history of His life also is rich in single and significant features, in which the course of nature corresponds with its course, this will be found in strict accordance with the parallelism in which nature is wont to develop itself with the spirit of man. In a case wherein the whole human race is, so to speak, concentrated in one life, on the conflict and victory of which its fate depends, and wherein the conflicts of this life have so culminated that the decisive moment has arrived by which the earth as well as humanity is to be glorified, we need not be surprised at convulsions of the earth. Why must sentient nature maintain at such a moment a stoical indifference, when in less important crises she has announced, so to speak, her co-operation with that divine Spirit which was directing the world's history? But the miraculous in the history of Jesus develops also a rich symbolism, which makes

one time they consider improbable, as being symbolical, they call at another anecdotes. An anecdote, however, is nothing but a striking and amusing occurrence—the direct opposite of a myth, or of any symbolic act. Hence, first bodies without souls, *i.e.*, anecdotes, and then souls without bodies, *i.e.*, myths, but never living ~~myths~~, ideal events, form the objects of their intellectual vision. The use of the word anecdote, in this connection, is specially damaging to De Wette's system.

brings

the whole world transparent to its very depths. The characters by whom our Lord is surrounded, as heroes of reciprocity for His spirit—a Peter, a James, a John; the dwellings which receive Him, such as the house at Bethany; the dark or darkened beings who oppose Him—a Judas, a Caiaphas, a Pilate,—how significant do they become by their relation to Christ, and by the effect of His light, in manifesting the depths of human nature, of the world, and of hell! Yes, every man whom the Lord touched, every creature, every fleeting occurrence, becomes a living mirror, an enlightening agency to the world. His Spirit is the miraculous finger which elicits from everything its peculiar tone, everything must respond to His word. This Spirit glorifies even His cross, by revealing His victory in the resurrection. In His sufferings on the cross is seen the reconciliation of the world, and by the light of this reconciliation a glory is shed upon all sorrow, upon all that is dark and terrible on earth, as being a dispensation of God's hidden kindness. Judgment is seen in its deep inward union with sin-annulling grace, and the world is illuminated to its very depths by the light of the divine government, glorifying itself in its victory over all evil. But it is also the same Spirit which transforms His fate into the most sublime poetical event. His life is, in its simple Gospel features, a sublime Messiad, which no poetry can surpass. It is a drama, assembling its lifelike characters in the centre of the world, and introducing, in the sharpest traits, in the most significant deeds, in the most sudden results, that catastrophe of whose all-affecting reality and result all tragic occurrences and fictions had prophesied—a catastrophe in which the curse of the Adamic race falls upon the holy child of this race, as the most terrible judgment of God upon the world, and yet a judgment which, through the infinite satisfaction of this holy sacrifice, becomes the reconciliation of the world and the means of its glorification. From the mortal agonies and heavenly victories of this history, are breathed upon every recipient soul the reviving and quickening influences of the peace of God. So real is the ideal world opened to us in the Gospel history. It is a wonderfully copious, a heavenly, a far-reaching reality, which the Philistine (Philister) beholds with alarm, and strives to represent as an obscure mythical image, in order to free himself from the powerful effect it has in disturbing his comfort. But where reality thus exhibits miracle, symbol, and poetry, in their highest unity, power, and depth, mythical representations are superseded,¹ and must vanish before the simple narratives of this reality; or, if they remain, can only be regarded as the timid apocryphal productions of popular Christianity in its immature state. Every abstract fiction must here be below the truth; and the assumption that this reality itself is such a fiction, is a pale phantom venturing to appear at midday.

¹See my work, *Ueber der geschichtlichen Charakter der kanon. Evang.*, p. 31.

NOTES.

1. Much discussion has of late taken place concerning the notion of myths, since the word has been so vaguely employed by many, and lately by Strauss, in matters theological. Invention, fiction, error, fable, and anecdote have all had to play their parts in the notion of the myth. Tholuck (*die Glaubewürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte*, p. 51, &c.), among others, animadverts upon this confusion. Strauss subsequently expressed himself more clearly. ‘We distinguish by the name of an evangelical myth, a narrative directly or indirectly referring to Jesus, which may be considered not as the expression of a fact, but as the deposit of an idea of His earliest followers. The myth, in this sense, will be met with, here as elsewhere, sometimes pure, as the substance of the narrative, sometimes as an accessory to actual history.’ This whole definition rests upon a misconception of the fundamental relations existing between ideas and facts. It assumes, in the Gospel history itself, a mutilated realization of eternal ideas; and in the narrative of the Gospel history an idealistic representation of these ideas, overgrowing the reality. The idea here works in a Neptunian, not a Plutonian manner; it can form ‘deposits’ of facts, and ‘wash away’ the firmer form of tradition in its floods, but is incapable of forming primitive rocks by igneous forces, and raising a new world from the deeps. The distinction between the historical and philosophical myth is not here allowed its due importance. The philosophical appears as the *pure* myth, drawing from two sources—from Old Testament Messianic expectations, and from the impression which Christ left behind Him; the historical, as a myth *appended to history*, and having for its foundation some isolated fact, of which enthusiasm takes possession, ‘in order to entwine it with mythic conceptions drawn from the idea of the Christ.’ Thus the pure or philosophic myth is doubly deprived of its real elements; first of the Messianic expectation in its real tendency, then of the impression made by Christ according to its real contents; and the historical myth doubly mutilated; for, first, there is an occurrence of which enthusiasm takes possession, instead of the occurrence awakening the enthusiasm; then the myth is formed out of this occurrence, not by being further fashioned in the fire of the idea, but by being ‘entwined,’ as with a garland, with mythic conceptions. So antagonistic to each other are the ideal and the actual in this province of criticism. They meet like Ahriman and Ormuzd. The Doceticism of a dualistic view of the universe, unable fully to grasp the mystery that the Son of God came in the flesh, here co-operates with the Ebionitism which insists upon seeing in the Christian Church an idealist far surpassing the prophet and his impression, and cannot comprehend that the flesh of Christ’s life was pervaded by the Spirit, His deeds (the supposed anecdotes) illuminated by the ideal; to which, therefore, the doctrine that Jesus is the Christ is still a foreign one. Doceticism never attains to a recognition of the fulness of the

Godhead in the midst of the manhood, the fulness of ideality crowned with reality. The ideal, in its flight over the earth, is only allowed to skim it like a swallow. Ebionitism, on the other hand, is incapable of recognising in the God-man, the Son of God who goes to the Father, and is raised up to the glory of the Father. According to its view, human nature only attains to the theories of the idealist—to a sort of bear's dance to the measure of the eternal, which it is unable to keep up, and soon falls heavily again upon its broad fore-feet. This swallow's flight of the ideal, this bear's dance of the actual, point to that constant schism in the world, or rather in the view of the world, entertained by the criticism in question, which may be regarded as the peculiar mark of Manichean error within the province of Christianity. The theological dictum on the notion of the myth is taken up *con amore* by Otfried Müller. Myths, says he (*Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie*, p. 59),¹ are, according to their external notion, 'narratives of the doings and destinies of individual personages, which, according to their connection and blending with each other, relate to a period antecedent to the historical era of Greece, and separated from it by a tolerably distinct boundary.' With respect to the internal notion of the myth, it is 'a mode of fusing together fact and idea' (p. 78). 'This union' (of the thing done and the thought entertained), says the author, 'takes place in most myths; and there are not many in which something real and something ideal may not be pointed out. *The older the myth, the more entirely is the fact blended with the thought.*' Hence, even the difference between the historic and philosophic myth, on which great stress was formerly laid, is relatively of less importance' (p. 70). It is entirely in accordance with Christian theology, that the older the myth is, the more entirely does the fact seem blended with the idea. The primitive is the type of the consummation. As, then, the highest myth in the centre of history consists in the union of the incidents of the actual, the marvellous, the symbolic or ideal, and the poetic, so must the first myth, at the beginning of pre-historic times, exhibit this union also. It is in the nature of things that here every idea should find its type in reality, and that, *vice versa*, every fact should be illuminated by its relation to the ideal. Gradually, however, a ramification takes place. The myth of Pandora, for instance, is at all events a philosophical myth; it represents the idea of the origin of evil by an occurrence. In the recovery of the Grecian Helen from Troy, on the contrary, we have a fact embellished into a highly significant myth, in which the nation that dedicated itself to the service of beauty, began its heroic deeds in conformity with this impulse.

¹ [Or p. 1 of Leitch's translation, entitled 'Introduction to a Scientific System of Mythology, by C. O. Müller,' Lond. 1844. By this work a great deal of light is thrown on the subject of this chapter, and generally on the idea, sources, determination of the age, and cessation of myths. It may be well to consult also Milman's *History of Christianity*, vol. i. pp. 115 and 129; though all that he says in these chapters will not be agreed with, and must indeed be considered to some extent dangerous.—ED.]

Finally, the harmonious union of all the incidents relating to the idealized fact, forms the poetic myth. Muller does not bring this forward as a peculiar kind of myth, but discusses the notions that appertain to it under the title, 'How the myth is to be distinguished from its treatment by poets and authors.' Here the psychological motive of the occurrences, and the arrangement of various legends into one harmonious whole, is defined as the poet's share in the embellishment of a fact. Compare Ullmann's treatise, *Historisch oder Mythisch*, p. 56.

On the distinction between the myth and the legend, compare George, *Ueber Mythus und Sage*, and Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 113. Strauss defines as legendary, on one hand, the inaccuracies, on the other, the colourings, modifying such history as passes through a long course of oral tradition. These formulae do not, however, in the least degree touch upon the real inner nature of the legend. The distinction of George would convert the historic myth into legend—myth and legend are almost one. The former is the legend of the Greeks, the latter the myth of the Germans. If, however, the essential distinction of these notions be required, it must be acknowledged that the myth poetically matures the scattered seed which has a religious signification, while the legend anticipatively expresses the recognition of the ideal in common, variegated, fantastic, or even terrible reality. When a misfortune consciously self-incurred is attributed to Nemesis, this is of the nature of the myth. When the shipwreck on the Lurley rocks, a mishap incurred by an unconscious fault, or by no fault at all, is ascribed to Loreley, this is of the nature of the legend.

2. In estimating the relation of the Gospel history to mythology, it must be considered, (1) as the original history of the new human race, or the real people of God, which, as such, can by no means be history in the usual sense, but only poetic, symbolic, and religious history; (2) as the commencement of a development of life, which, in conformity with its nature, is a manifestation of truth; and especially of the truth of the ideal, verified in its facts, and of the facts verified in their ideal nature. According to the notion of Christianity, it is impossible that it should be surpassed, enriched, or carried further, by any embellishments.

3. Prophecy exhibits a series of real interactions between the real and the ideal. The idea of prophecy, which many theologians had thrown away as a weed, has been brought back to them by botanists and poets, who have begun to recognize, even in the life of plants, the nature of prophecy. Göthe's poem *Die Metamorphosen der Pflanzen* is, in this respect, very significant. All those phenomena of natural life, which not only externally announce, but also internally prepare a higher development, as, e.g., the leaf does the flower, present an image of prophecy.

The myth, on the contrary, has its type in the various allusions, or lights and shadows, in which nature is so abundant. Thus the

moon, for example, upon whose dark but real body is impressed, so to speak, the image of the sun's brightness, the ideal of its nature seems to be an image of the historical myth. The dawn, on the other hand, denotes the philosophical myth : we have here the young day which, before its appearance in the world, forms in the clouds of heaven a beautiful but unsubstantial corporeity. The rainbow represents figuratively the original unity of the two kinds of myths ; the primitive myth, for the clouds representing obscure reality is illumined by the light, but the light, denoting the colourless ideal, develops all its variegated splendour in its union with this reality. Finally, the reflection of the heavens in a clear stream seems a natural emblem of the poetic myth. As the bright images of the sun and moon appear in the watery mirror, fulfilling the saying, '*Kehrt wellenathmend ihr Gesicht nicht doppelt schöner her?*' so do the pure reflections of ideal history, or of the mythically incorporated ideal, appear with enhanced splendour in the element of poetry.

SECTION VI.

THE EFFECT OF THE IDEAL HISTORY : THE SACRED REMEMBRANCE.

Great characters manifest themselves by great exhibitions of their power. These exhibitions are confirmed by the great impressions they produce within the sphere of their operation. These impressions, finally, continue in the abundant, clear, and powerful reminiscences of those whose minds were affected by them. The stronger the impression a man has received, the greater will be the power with which it will, during his whole life, prevail over all weaker impressions and remembrances. The more general this impression is, and the greater the number of the minds who share it, the longer will its memory survive, both in the private intercourse and public announcements of a community. But if the impression be a religious, a practical, a vital one, it must of necessity be exhibited in the life of the community, whose very spiritual being stands in constant interaction with this its remembrance. In proportion, finally, as this impression is consolatory and elevating, will the memorial, in which it resounds through the world, and through time, be a sacred one. It was consequently inevitable, that the effect of the life of Jesus should be impressed and perpetuated, in a sacred memorial upon the life, and within the circle of His followers, by means of the Gospel history ; for the most powerful effect which mankind ever experienced, lay in the exhibition of His divine-human life, by which the glory of God was fully manifested in the midst of mankind. Hence the remembrance of Him and of His history is the predominating historical thought of the human race, and surpasses all other human remembrances. The effect of Christ's life has, from the very first, affected through its divine power the whole

human race, by means of that agitation which it produced among His immediate followers. It is an effect still propagated by means of the members of His Church, and one which will never cease till it has penetrated the whole body of humanity. As a religious influence, however, or rather as *the* religious influence, proceeding as it does from perfect religion, it constitutes a church, whose spiritual life is identical with its remembrance. The highest solemnity of the Christian life, *e.g.*, is the showing forth of the death and victory of Christ in the Lord's Supper. If then we contemplate the matter of the Gospel history in the impression it has left on Christian life, in the assurance of the manifestation of God, of the atonement, of victory over death, and of the heavenly glory of Christ and His people, the conclusion is irresistible, that in this definite and full memorial of the Christian Church we behold a sacred memorial to all mankind of the great days and great facts of their reunion with God. The effect of Christ's life and deeds may be regarded generally as the greatest shock ever experienced by mankind.¹ As such it naturally commanded the attention even of the enemies of Christ, and of those who unconsciously experienced its agency in their very enmity. His enemies could not free themselves from the remembrance of Him, though they deformed it into a caricature, through the false medium of their self-delusion, as they had before experienced only exasperation and delusion through their perversion of His agency. The watchful and zealous hatred which, according to the Acts of the Apostles, was ever excited by the announcement of Christ's death and resurrection, bears witness to this. The Roman power, whose representative, Pontius Pilate, had, in his weak and false hesitation, suffered himself to be seduced to the execution of the Jewish designs against Jesus, received by this execution its first impulse to an inimical disposition towards Christ. It was in the sphere of this inimical disposition, that the accounts propagated by Tacitus and Suetonius² concerning Christ were formed. Even in the high places of Roman life, the spirits of the day very soon received a faint impression of that great spiritual conflict and victory, whose effects were from henceforth to agitate the world.

This inimical representation of the agency of Christ, expressed in obscure traditions concerning Him, was surrounded by a more general sphere of indefinite astonishment at the spiritual power He displayed. Under such an impression did Josephus write of Christ.³

But within the circle of the recipient minds of the elect, the impression left by Christ's personality was a bright and blessed one,

¹ [See an eloquent passage in Ewald's *Geschichte Christus' und seiner Zeit*, Pref. xi. (Ed. 1857). 'For all time,' he says, 'this divine-human life has become the most brilliant light; and who can still love error, who can hang his head and doubt, if once he has opened his eyes in this light? In what time, in what condition, in what breast does not this inextinguishable light shine?'—ED.]

² Tacitus, Ann. xv. 44; Suetonius, Vita Claud. c. 25.

³ Josephus, Ant. xviii. 3, 3.

condemning the old life of sin, and implanting the new life of love and righteousness. Here, then, the remembrance of Christ was a continual festival. In this form it must, according to its very nature, so outweigh and outlast, illuminate and purify, all the other remembrances of believers, and bring them into inward connection with itself, as to become the enlightening and penetrating principle of all those other remembrances. How could it indeed fail to become the principle of all the remembrances of Christians, when it became the principle of their whole Christian life?

The historical word, by which the Gospel narrative has been handed down to us, corresponds with the historical power of the Gospel life. These two aspects of Christ's continual operation are fundamentally identical. Consequently, the Church may either be regarded as a lasting and real remembrance of Him, or as the continuous operation of His life. As the moon, though a thousand times more distant, is nearer to our room than the lamp in a neighbour's house, because its effect is a thousand times more powerful, and as the sun again is infinitely nearer than the moon, though with respect to space only, it again is situated at an immensely greater distance,¹ so is Christ, though so far removed from us as to His glorified body by the external relations of space, infinitely nearer to us by the power of His operation than any man in our immediate neighbourhood; nay, He is with us, and through faith He is in us, by the power of this His operation. These are the ideal relations of space. So also the geography of the spirit and of love has very different estimates of nearness and distance on earth from the geography of mathematical science. And that which is here said of space, is equally applicable to time. According to the Christology of space, Christ is said to be here, in virtue of the effect He produces, just as the sun is said, in virtue of what it effects, to be in and on the earth. According to the Christology of time, or according to the chronology of the Christian mind, the Church, when celebrating the remembrance of the Lord, and proclaiming it to others, rightly says, 'He was but just now here, and He will soon come again: He comes quickly.' The Christology of time is not understood by those² who say that the apostles were misled by an enthusiastic excitement, in their announcements that the Lord's

¹ Distant as the sun may be from our eyes, so soon as it is perceived, it is, by means of the rays proceeding from it, immediately in our eye. There is between the seeing eye, as such, and the seen sun, as such, no space which can hinder the vision and consequent enjoyment of the sun; the beam brings it as near as is necessary for the eye to see it, without injury. All that we can enjoy of the sun comes to us in its beams; by its beams all space between us and it is as good as annihilated. Thus do I, by means of a sensible image, form a conception of the agency of Christ, while He is at a distance from me, and personally visible and present in some one of the heavens.—See Lavater's *Jesus Christus stets dasselbe*, p. 31.

² [In the last instance by Renan (*Vie de Jesus*, p. 275): 'Que tout cela fut pris à la lettre par les disciples et par le maître lui-même à certains moments, c'est ce qui éclate dans les écrits du temps avec une évidence absolue. Si la première génération chrétienne a une croyance profonde et constante, c'est que le monde est sur le point de finir,' &c. What Jowett has to say on this 'error of the apostles' may be seen in his *Epistles of St Paul*, i. p. 120.—Ed.]

coming was at hand. They were but giving expression to that elevation of feeling, wherewith the mature Christian, as an heir of God and of eternity, looks upon time, so that to him, as to his God, according to the measure of his spirituality, a thousand years are as one day. In this respect, the highest conception of time may be explained by a still higher. The glorious entry of Luther into Worms is fresher and nearer to us, than the more modern disputes of Lutheran theologians; and Hermann the Cheruscan seems but just now to have led the Germans to victory over Rome, while the last trial for witchcraft seems already quite ancient history. But the memory of Christ, of His death and victory, surpasses all other human remembrances in ever youthful freshness. The ever-enduring Church of Christ is His ever-enduring memorial.

But we have here more especially in view that remembrance of Him still living in the historic word, which must have originated in the apostolic Church. This remembrance must of necessity be proportionate to the unique effect produced by Christ's life, and therefore infinitely profound and powerful, fully developed and definite, and, in its totality or completeness, blessed and sacred. The men whom Christ had apprehended, might forget everything else; but Him, His work, His deeds, His sufferings, the manifestations of His glory, they could not forget. The Spirit of Christ, poured out upon them at the conclusion of His work, was the unifying principle which connected all their remembrances, the vital element which renewed and preserved them. They must have felt themselves impelled by the mighty effect Christ's life had upon them, to be ever recalling to each others' memories, and proclaiming to the world, the great facts upon which it rested. Their life was blended with the Gospel history; their reconciliation to God and their salvation were identified with it; hence the glorious treasure of their Gospel reminiscences could not possibly fade. They saw in the life of the Lord Jesus the supreme miracle which had brought deliverance to the world: its facts, therefore, must have been continually filling them with silent, deep, and glorious emotion. 'It was about the tenth hour,' says John, when relating his first meeting with Jesus (John i. 39). He could no more forget the hour, than a mother could forget that wherein her child had been born into the world. Mary kept all the sayings which glorified her Saviour-Son, in her heart. 'We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard,' declared the apostles, before the Sanhedrim. No man can be hindered from proclaiming those great, most certain, and most glorious experiences, in which his own spiritual life originated, and by which it has continued to grow.¹ Hence the preaching of the apostles was a giving vent to those words of joy which gushed forth from the abundance of their own animated reminiscences. It has of late been asserted

¹ No Christian can be forbidden to bear testimony to his own blessedness in fellowship with Christ; this inalienable right makes him truly a preacher, as the right of hearty intercession makes him truly a priest.

that the apostles did not set forth the Gospel history, but only announced the dogmas of Christianity. Evangelical metaphysics perhaps? But the very first dogma of Christianity—the Word was made flesh—is also an historical fact. And therefore the sublimity and vigour of apostolic teaching consisted in the fact, that they proclaimed the word of Christ in its living union with facts; or, in other words, that the facts of His life, and especially of His death and resurrection, were set forth in the ideality of His word; these being the two parts of the living unity, in which this teaching was delivered to our faith. Certainly these two great facts, the death and resurrection of Christ, formed the key-note of apostolic testimony. But could the death of Christ have obtained its own special importance to their hearers, if they had not also depicted the chief features of His life? And could they have represented His resurrection as a certain fact, if they had not also narrated His subsequent appearances? It is certain that the Evangelists made it a part of their task to hand down copious details of this kind. Whence, then, should they have derived their materials, if not from the communications of the witnesses who held immediate intercourse with the Lord? These witnesses were the living Gospel; the Church, with which the most copious, the clearest, and brightest reminiscences of Jesus were as entirely one as the scent of a fresh-blown rose is one with the rose.

Those writers who, in our days, are beginning to deny all certainty and trustworthiness to apostolic tradition with respect to the life of Jesus, seem to have lived so long in the region of modern literature and periodicals, where one wave so quickly swallows up another, where the latest novelty so rapidly fades before another, and where one point of view is so hastily abandoned for another, as to have gradually lost the power of forming a clear conception of the fervour, uniqueness, and power of the apostolic memory. As children of time, serving the temporal god, the process-god, with a memory revolving in constant change of impressions, about the feverish unrest of an unstable heart, they are the very antipodes to those happy men who, living by the power of Christ's Spirit with Him in His eternity, preserved in the tranquil depths and fervent emotions of their hearts, and in constant sabbatic peace, the most divine and solemn remembrance of His life, His death, and His glorification; in whose inner life the facts of the New Testament ever continued novelties, retaining the original brilliancy of blooming flowers, of molten silver, or of the eternal thoughts of God. In our days of worldliness and newspapers, the contents of the memory are ever more and more perplexed and saddened by the unrest of the heart while the great experiences and remembrances of the apostolic Church maintained their imperishable brightness and beauty, because they were founded upon a heart-life penetrating to the depths of eternity, reposing on God, filled with all the fulness of Christ.

NOTE.

While we may agree with Hug (*Einleit. ins N. T.*), that the apostles did not perhaps in public assemblies so recount the history of Christ's life according to its circumstances and sequence, that their statements could have been formed into historical books; it does not follow that in their instruction, 'so far as it was merely historical,' they limited themselves 'to the sufferings of the Lord, His death, and that pillar of their doctrine, His resurrection.' When Weisse appeals, in support of this view (*die ev. Gesch.* p. 21, &c.), to the small amount of Gospel narrative contained in the apostolic Epistles, the great difference between the oral agency of the apostles, by which they founded churches, and the written agency, by which they built them up, is not sufficiently borne in mind.¹

¹ [The whole of the third chapter of Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* should be consulted on this point, and especially the remarks on the form of the apostolic preaching, p. 158.—ED.]

PART II.

THE MORE GENERAL RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF THE LORD JESUS.

SECTION I.

GENERAL SURVEY.

THE special historical records of the life of Jesus are the four Gospels. They form the centre of all evangelical testimony to Jesus, and exhibit the direct impression made by His wondrous personality in the sphere of literary composition. But this centre was no isolated phenomenon. The contents of the Gospels are assumed, required, and supported by the whole of the New Testament, and especially by the Acts of the Apostles, just as the historical books of the Old Testament are assumed by the contents of the Psalms and the Prophets. Roses and lilies do not grow rootless out of the earth: as little does the testimony of the theocratically inspired life of the Old Testament, or the life of Christ in the New Testament. The whole New Testament, however, may again be looked upon as only the conclusion and climax of a more general organism, namely, of the Holy Scripture. The Old Testament does not contain its conclusion within itself. They who would separate the New Testament from the Old, have this enigma to solve, how it happened that the robust oak thus suddenly stopped short in the midst of its growth—why it terminated in a gnarled stump, instead of attaining its appropriate leafy crown? The essential contents of the Bible are accredited by the two greatest religious phenomena which ever appeared, and which have endured to the present day, viz., Christianity and Judaism. That line of theocratic Monotheism which forms the key-note in the history of the religious life of all mankind, leads, both by its bright side, Christianity, and its reverse side, Talmudism, to the high region of biblical facts and institutions. But it is not so easy to infer the nature of the former blossom from the broken shell of the fruit, as from the fruit itself. The Christian Church, as the fruit of that wondrous blossom, the facts and teachings of the Bible, is a great and lasting testimony to their truth. As in the vegetable world, the kingdom of the flowering plants rests upon that of the leafy, so is it itself again the bright circle supported by the darker ground of the general religious con-

sciousness of mankind. It is not possible to imagine the present world deprived of the Christian Church, without regarding it as maimed, deprived of its powers of development, and orphaned. Thus the four Gospels form the centre of a series of spheres indissolubly linked with each other. If the jewel is torn out of a brilliant ring, the setting becomes worthless and unmeaning; and it is thus with the Gospel history, with regard to its setting. Since, however, the life of the Lord Jesus is thus connected with those more general circles of life which concentrically surround it, it must have left a more or less distinct impression on all these enclosing circles. And they may thus all be called records of the life of Jesus. The order, then, of the general records of the life of Jesus appears to be as follows: (1.) The New Testament; (2.) the Old Testament; (3.) the theocracy, especially the Christian Church; (4.) the religious life of the human race.

NOTE.

The bright side of the history of mankind stands fundamentally in the closest connection with the glorious history of the Gospel, while even its dark side points towards it; and when once the scientific knowledge of that great organism, humanity, is as mature as the knowledge of animal organisms, an organic prophecy, pointing to the Gospel history, will at length be discovered in every greater fragment of history. Thus, *e.g.*, cannibals, as representing the deepest degradation of humanity, furnish a significant hint of the compass of the human gamut. As the depth of the water on a rock-bound coast represents with tolerable accuracy the height of the overhanging precipices, so do those depths of degradation point upwards past the middle regions of civilisation, to a heavenly perfection of humanity. In a narrower sphere, the same inference may be made of Israel's crowning point, from Israel's degradation. Many important nations have a far less extended scale of spiritual variation than the most important: the former are of average talent; the latter exhibit, as it were, hills and valleys in giant-like masses, as, *e.g.*, the German nation. The Israelitish nation is, so to speak, a nation with two rows of keys. This applies in a higher degree to mankind in general.

SECTION II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The history of the life of Jesus is accredited, in its leading features, not only by the four Gospels, but by the whole New Testament. The book of the Acts of the Apostles continues the history of Christianity in the same tone, and in the same spirit, in which the Gospels relate the history of Christ. The three chief incidents of His life, the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension, it distinctly brings forward. The disciples of the Gospels here figure as apostles;

but even in their new condition, their individual characters are quite in accordance with the characteristics attributed to them in the Gospels, and the most significant are conspicuous. The miracles of Jesus are repeated in the miracles of His disciples, even to the greatest, the raising of the dead. But even from the apostolic Epistles and the Apocalypse, we obtain a distinct impression of the life of Jesus,—an impression, moreover, which is enriched with many special features. According to the teaching of these apostolic writings, Christ was the Son of David according to the flesh (Rom. i. 3, 4), the second man, the Lord from heaven, a quickening spirit (1 Cor. xv. 45–47), born of a woman (Gal. iv. 4). His teaching is unfolded in the teaching of the apostles (1 Cor. ii.), His miracles, in the miraculous gifts of the primitive Church (1 Cor. xii.), His great conflict with the carnal mind of His people, in the experience of His witnesses (2 Cor. ii. 15, &c.), the institution of the Lord's Supper in St Paul's description of the same (1 Cor. xi.); while His crucifixion and resurrection form the all-pervading elements of the apostolic Epistles, as being the most essential incidents of His life, of Gospel preaching, and of Christian experience. The form of Christ is thus apparent in the apostolic writings; and they who would oppose the essential features of the Gospel narrative, have to deal not with the four Gospels only, but with the whole New Testament. Even the Epistles of the New Testament are Gospels.

NOTE.

In his essay, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte*, p. 372, &c., Tholuck, with reference to Strauss's criticism of the life of Jesus, expresses himself, concerning the relation of the representation of the life of Jesus in the four Gospels to its representation in the New Testament in general, in the following words: 'In passing from the Gospels to the Acts we might have expected to find no more mention of miracles. We do not, however, meet with so abrupt a cessation, but find, on the contrary, that the Acts and apostolic Epistles, together with the Gospel narratives, form one continuous series, and that a continuous series of the miraculous. Christ is not depicted like the sun in tropical countries, which rises without a dawn and sets without a twilight; but as a thousand years of prophecy preceded Him, so do miracles follow Him, and the forces which He first evoked continue to work for a time, with greater or less activity. Hence, if criticism would banish the sun from the world, it has still to deal with the dawn and the twilight.' The forces which Christ evoked do not, indeed, continue their activity only 'for a time,' but till the end of the world, and beyond it. It was, however, for a time that they maintained the first form of their activity, a form breaking violently through the old life, and therefore miraculous.¹

¹ [The argument to be drawn from the identity of the representations of Christ in the Gospels and in the remaining books of the New Testament, has been elaborated with his usual delicacy and richness of treatment, and urged with remarkable skill

SECTION III.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The picture which the scriptures of the Old Testament furnish of the Messiah, is drawn with great clearness and boldness. Though single features only are given in the several delineations, yet are these all founded on, and developed from the same general view. In the Old Testament scriptures Christ is the end of the divine promise, and the object of human desire. The older theology delighted to find Him in the more obscure passages of the Old Testament writings, *e.g.*, in the plural form, ‘Let us make man’ (Gen. i. 26), in the ‘sight of the Lord’ (Deut. iv. 37), in ‘the angel of the covenant’ (Mal. iii. 1), and similar passages. Modern rational theology, however, would scarcely any longer admit the existence of an expectation of a Messiah, and especially of a suffering Messiah, in the Old Testament, until suddenly the wind veered round to another quarter, and then it was said that Christ was in the Old Testament, but scarcely a shadow of Him in the New; that the Christian Church had derived the miraculous element contained in her representation of her founder from the Old Testament delineations of the Messiah. Thus were the stem and flower alternately denied, while the fact was lost sight of, that history is as little accustomed as nature to exhibit such monstrous instances of incompleteness. But when once a clear notion of the nature of the Christ of the Old Testament is arrived at, a real fulfilment of the expectation there held out will be demanded. The coming of Messiah is involved in that constant reaching forth to things to come, which is the very spirit of the Old Covenant. This covenant not merely exhibits the contrast between the divine and the human, but also that interaction of both, that approach, that mutual grasp, the consummation of which was to be their real union in the God-man. The patriarchal promise advances from the promise of the blessing to the promise of the individual who was to bring the blessing, *the* Prophet; while even the law, much as it appears to deal chiefly with the outward letter, is founded upon the idea of human nature as it ought to be, and therefore upon the God-man. Typicism sets forth, in shadowy form, not only the work of atonement, but also the Atoner Himself; the official anointing designates each aspect of Christ’s life, His prophetic, priestly, and kingly nature; and from the descriptions of the Messiah in the Old Testament, especially in the writings of the prophets, may be gathered a full delineation of Himself. The same spirit, *e.g.*, which reproves the zealous Elijah (1 Kings xix. 10, &c.), appears in the declaration wherewith Christ rebukes the zealous disciples (Luke ix. 55). When we find ideal

against negative criticism, by Isaac Taylor in his *Restoration of Belief*, Cambridge, 1855. And for the cessation of miraculous powers see (not Bushnell, nor even Pascal, but) the very judicious remarks in Burton’s *Lectures on the Eccles. Hist. of the First Three Centuries*, vol. ii. pp. 5 and 230.—ED.]

traits of such peculiarity and delicacy, from the Old Testament, incarnate in the life of Christ, we can no longer feel surprised at the New Testament incarnation of the more general features of the Old Testament revelation. Christ's birth by the Spirit, His holy life, gentleness, fearful conflict, bitter sufferings, death, victory, and glory; the reconciliation, renewal, and transformation of the world; these are those broad features of the Messiah, in which the New Testament is one with the Old, the fulfilment with the hope. Yes, we find in the prophets, as in all the sacred Scriptures, the blossoms of the real incarnation of God, afterwards to ripen into the perfect fruit. No impersonal Messiah, no merely general idea of the perfectibility of man, could follow the Isaiah of actual history. If we could imagine the New Testament lost for a time, a theological Cuvier would be able to infer its existence and general nature from the peculiarities of the Old. Such scientific diviners were the prophets. From the great ones of former times, from Abraham, Moses, and David, they could infer the coming glory of Christ. It is a contradictory and unhistorical procedure, arising from the want of a sense for the organic, both in nature and history, to make an unchristian Old Testament precede the Christianity of the New, or a mythological New Testament follow the christological Old Testament. An assumption of so monstrous a kind is in its very nature a mutilated romance, a necessary development from the pantheistic notion of the universe; while, on the other hand, the recognition of the organic connection between the Old and New Testaments, is the result of the recognition of an eternal, personal God, and consequently of Jehovah, the God presiding with consistent freedom over all history.

NOTES.

1. It is only in their mutual connection that either the Old or the New Testament can be thoroughly understood. The Talmudist separates the New Testament from the Old, as a false excrescence, and idolizes the Old exclusively, teaching that it has always been in the bosom of God. Thus the living God, ever cherishing the Son in His inmost nature, becomes to him but a kind of grey-bearded rabbi, employed, in the eternity before the world, in drawing up the holy book, the Thorah. (Compare *De Wette, Einl. in das Alte Testament*, p. 19.) The antipodes of the Talmudists, in their view of the canon, are the ancient and modern Gnostics, who thought to purify and elevate the canon by separating the New Testament from the Old, and denying the identity of the God of the New with the Jehovah of the Old Testament. The ancient Gnostics could not appreciate the Old Testament, because they were infected with the dualistic view of the universe, which regarded matter as evil. In this respect, the pure ideality in which the Old Testament represents creation as the product of the Word of God, was abhorrent to them, as were also all its consequents, especially the real incarnation of the Son of God. It is by the same error that the modern

Gnostics are led into misconceptions of the Old Testament. In the fact that they explain sin as a result of finity, and see in individual definiteness only the limitation of the spirit, we recognise the old dualism in its subtlest form and most virulent distinctness. The New Testament God, however, of whom they form conceptions in such contrast with the eternal Jehovah, is in reality the impersonal, evanescent phantom of religious sentimentality, cherishing within himself the evanescent universe, a counterpart to the rigid rabbi with his ever rigid Thorah in his bosom. According to the Talmudists, the Son of God is a perpetual law-book; according to the Gnostics, a continuous metamorphosis of the world. The latter are entirely ignorant of the simple law, that the God of revelation, for the very reason that He is ever the same, must assume a varying form in presence of the varying degrees in which the religious consciousness is developed. The same human father, of whom the boy of ten years old says, How unkind my father is! appears to the matured young man of twenty, a father who, even in his chastisements, was but maintaining the discipline of love. The more modern enemies of the Old Testament have especially set themselves against the circumstance of thunder being ascribed to Jehovah, overlooking the fact that thunder is always an actual fact; that it is quite natural to ascribe this phenomenon to the all-affecting God; and that, finally, it is only the difference between regarding thunder as sent by God with intentional reference to some event, or as sent by Him without such intentional reference.

2. Old Testament Christology has hitherto suffered from many deficiencies. The christological element has been chiefly or exclusively sought in significant particulars, instead of recognized in the entire development of Old Testament life. Secondly, the process of formation of the New Testament, or christological life in the Old Testament, its gradations, and, consequently, its organization, have not been duly estimated. And, thirdly, it has been specially forgotten that this process of formation is not a merely figurative one, exhibiting the dogmatic image of Christ, but, at the same time, a substantial one, consummated in the actual God-man. In the latter respect Christology has been much injured by Nestorian views, which have not duly estimated the manner in which the life of Christ Himself was gradually introduced by the consecrations of the lives of many, found in the line of the Old Testament genealogy of Mary. Misconceptions of the relation of the Old Testament to the New have been entertained in modern times, especially by Schleiermacher (see his *Glaubenslehre*, vol. ii. p. 346, and other places) and Hegel (see his *Religions-Philosophie*, vol. ii.)

SECTION IV.

THE THEOCRACY, ESPECIALLY THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

In viewing the theocracy as the historical development of the kingdom of God, it may be regarded under three principal forms.

First, it appears in the growth of its peculiar life, as this advances towards full maturity. This maturity is manifested by the circumstance of the ripened fruit of the sacred organism bursting its decaying shell, and wholly freeing itself from it. The sacred plant is the Old Testament Church ; the shell, Talmudism ; the fruit, the Christian Church. The Messiah being then indisputably the central point of the theocracy, these three forms of religious life must of necessity all point, by decided christological indications, to the history of Christ's life. In fact, the preliminaries of this history appear even in such particulars as the Old Testament assumes. The first fundamental law of Old Testament history is this, that the kingdom of God is founded by distinguished and chosen individuals. It is to such individuals that the Lord says, 'I give people for thy life' (Isa. xlivi. 4). The theocracy does not reckon the greatness of humanity by heaping numbers upon numbers, nor by the combination of ' millions of perukes or socks.' It is not the ant-hill in which undistinguished equality prevails, but the beehive in which all is done with reference to a mystically governing queen, which is the type of the theocratic ideal of human nature. The second characteristic of the theocracy is, that it regards history from the point of view afforded by its unity, whether that unity is considered with respect to its extension in the contemporary history of various nations, or its duration during periods. Much has been said concerning the isolation of Israel in the Old Testament ; but it must not be ignored, that this isolation is the struggle of the morbid monotheistic spirit of Israel with the polytheistic nations—a struggle decidedly demanding and announcing the union of other nations with Israel, while the heathen nations, in spite of all their intermingling, pursued their several courses side by side, without any feeling that they were destined for union. This theocratic view of the unity of history points towards the point of union. Thirdly, the theocracy had a deep conviction of being an organism, the purpose of whose development it was to exhibit the formation of true religion and its progress towards perfection. The prophets are full of distinctions between the various gradations of religious life under the Old Testament, and their special vocation is the announcement of its consummation, the manifestation of the kingdom of God in and through the God-man. Finally, the theocracy also lays great stress upon the ironical contrast in which the arrangements of the divine economy stand to the assumptions of ordinary worldly understanding. God, for example, chooses the little to represent the eternal ; the mean, despised nation of the Jews becomes the instrument of revelation ; the obscure country of Palestine, and of this country the poor province of Galilee, and of this province the despised town of Nazareth, is the theatre of its highest miracles. A worldling would certainly not have chosen 'a corner in Galilee' for the manifestation of such things, but rather the great Mongolian steppe, where the 'specimens of the genus' manage their horses in countless troops. This fundamental principle of the

theocracy, the manifestation of the great in the little, leads the religious sense upon the track of the Nazarene, the Crucified. Even Talmudism, that decayed husk of the theocratic life, the obverse of the history of the New Testament kingdom of God, is forced to bear testimony, by distinct allusions, to the history of Christ. The still prevailing expectation of a personal Messiah is the soul which holds together, keeps on its feet, and drives through the world, the dry skeleton of the wandering Jew. The power of the stumbling-stone may be inferred from the force with which it has hurled the unhappy nation through all the world, and crushed and scattered its members. The fate of the Jewish people bears the impress of the tremendous conflict they have waged against their destiny, their guilty resistance of their vocation, and the glory of this vocation. Thus their fate also leads us to infer the fulness and holiness of that manifestation of God in actual history, at which they stumbled, and against which they fell. Finally, the dead formalism of Talmudism finds its counterpart in the Christian festival of Whitsuntide, and in the Christian Church. The Church is, moreover, the expanded Gospel, because it bears the life of Christ within itself. All its vital powers are in their nature one, and point, in this oneness, to the oneness of their source, the *one* perfect personality of the God-man. They are also all ideally real; whenever their nature as matured powers is fully manifested; and as such they cannot be the product of an idealistic imaginative school, but must be the result of a perfect, potent, ideally real life, perpetuated in the establishment of a Church. These vital powers have, moreover, been overgrown by certain particulars of merely ecclesiastical remembrance; yet even under this form they point to as many particulars of Gospel history. In the glorification of the blessed Virgin, *e.g.*, is contained a perpetual announcement of the miraculous birth of Christ. The great incidents of the life of Christ, everywhere appear in the festivals, dogmas, and vital powers of the Church. How decidedly does the Church's joy in the midst of affliction, her glorying in the cross, point to the death of Christ, its influence and glorious results! Can the perpetual testimony of the Christian Church to the resurrection and ascension of Christ, by its assurance of victory over death, by its hope of the glory of the future life, be mistaken? When we consider, further, the divine vital forces of the Church, in their opposition to the fashion and notions of the world, we are constrained to wonder at the might of that spiritual irruption, with which they burst forth from their fountain to conquer the resistance of the ancient world, and are consequently led to the conclusion, that they could only have become matters of history through a series of miracles; just as a lofty mountain stream can only fight its appointed course through a country by means of a series of waterfalls. Thus do even our institutions for the blind, our hospitals, and asylums point to that glorious chaplet of miracles by which Christ was surrounded in the energizing effect of His miraculous life. Finally, all may be summed up in the one

remark, that the life of the Church of Christ is a manifestation of the presence of the Holy Ghost. This presence of the Spirit of God, however, as the Holy Spirit, assumes the perfection of the Gospel life in its fulness, its totality, its infinite depth, and pure reality. An idealistic immature religious life, a life terminating in the bud and never advancing beyond its first beginnings, might announce the presence of the Spirit of God, but the Spirit is not manifested as the Holy Spirit, till the manifestation of the Son is perfected. How could the return of the Son to the Father take place, before His coming from the Father into the world was perfected? Not till the manifestation of the Son was completed, could that free life, with which all the incidents of His life are identified, flow forth to sanctify the Church, that is, to lead her back with the Son out of the world into union with God. Thus the Church, as the stream of divine life, testifies to its sublime source, the life of Jesus (John vii. 39).

NOTES.

1. The separation which exists between Israel and other nations, expresses its inward relation to those nations in the same manner as the separation of the Christian Church from her excommunicated members expresses her suffering for them, and her desire for reunion with them in the communion of Christ. And as, in our days, a spirit of moral slumber makes men find more humanity in the rude, natural intercourse of the heathen nations, than in that separation between Israel and the world, so also do they find more Christianity in the moral laxity of the Church than in her exhibition of social Christian decision. The notion of discipline seems as alarming as though the very alphabet of the rights of a community were past comprehension.

2. A counterpart to the active religious penetration of Israel, by means of which it embraced Monotheism, is furnished by the passive religious penetration of the ancient Indians, which produced the nobler forms of the ancient Pantheism. And as an historical confiscation of the privileges of the Israelitish Monotheists is exhibited in the homeless Jews, so is a similar event exhibited in the case of the Indian Pantheists in the homeless gypsies. The ideal liberty of modern Pantheists was long ago realized in the wandering and forest life of the gypsies.

3. On the import of Christ's death upon the cross, and of the founding of His Church thereupon, with respect to the fulness and peculiarity of the Gospel history, compare the striking treatise of Ullmann, *What does the establishment of the Christian Church by a crucified man assume?* in his collection of shorter writings, entitled *Historisch oder Mythisch*.

4. When, in modern philosophy, the Spirit is regarded merely as the Holy Spirit, the high significance of the successive gradations in which the Spirit manifests His life, is overlooked in the general unity of spiritual existence. The creative Spirit who

forms a stone in nature, is certainly identical with the Holy Spirit who leads a Christian heart from worldliness to union with God. But it is only in the latter work that we see the sublime summit of the Spirit's development, the whole glory of His nature as the Sanctifier. The distinctions in the biblical delineation of the Spirit rest upon depths of perception and definiteness of view which philosophy, with a somewhat ambiguous absence of presentation, often entirely overlooks.

SECTION V.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF MANKIND.

The spiritual life of mankind everywhere manifests an irrepressible attraction towards great personalities. Everywhere in the history of mind there is seen in full activity the impulse to behold human nature in its heroic proportions, to see the scattered characteristics of human power united in representations of great men, to be internally united with 'the million' by the strong organic centres and heads of the human circle, to contemplate the honours of the race in its higher representatives. The anticipation is everywhere prevalent, that each new great man will bring a new blessing, new help, new comfort (Gen. v. 29),—that deliverance must be born into the world in the depths of elect personal life. The highest expectations are entertained of the very elect: it is they who are to declare the mysteries of the divine life; nay, the glory of God's majesty is one day to burst forth victoriously from the most perfect and exalted human life. This universal gravitation of minds, attracting them towards great men, is the deepest and most natural basis of all that is christological in mankind at large. In its development and purification, it is more and more perceived to be a decided desire for the highest and most finished personality,—a desire to behold the human race in its spiritual unity, in its true and glorious destiny, in the fulness, beauty, and liberty of its sanctified spiritual power, in complete union with God, and in all the dignity and blessedness resulting from this union.

This christological feature of human nature may be recognised under manifold forms. The heart's need of uniting and surrendering itself to a hero of God, to one nobler than itself, to an intellectual prince, and of becoming rich and strong in him, has been a thousand times perverted by levity, and the intoxication of vanity, into the most credulous and most miserable absurdity. Nay, absurdity itself is but the corrupt and perverted form of the need and destination of thousands to be united, saved, and glorified by the true Lord and Prince of their life. It appears in the wild delusions of the thousands who plunge themselves into the snare of any splendid error, as soon as the sound of its decoy is heard; it brings rich booty to adventurers, fanatics, and conquerors; it drives whole swarms of deluded and devoted enthusiasts, who failed to recognize

the true, to every false Messiah; and it is the sphere in which the antichristian and demoniac powers will reap their harvest (Matt. xxiv. 24). Such a disposition of human nature must be fatal to it, if there be no salutary object to correspond with it. Men must be ruined by the magic attraction of brilliant but evil genii, if the attraction of the good do not prove more powerful still. They must be torn to pieces by the various attractions they experience from the glorious or strong personalities within whose influence they are placed, unless they be delivered from all lesser sympathies by one preponderating attraction, and be thus enabled to attain to unity of purpose and life. They must, finally, be irrecoverably lost to liberty, if this *one* personality be not identical with truth, righteousness, and love, and if surrender thereto be not the perfect emancipation of the spirit. Thus does this propensity, even in its perversion, point to the personality of Christ; for the very existence of a propensity capable of leading its subject into the arms of his destroyer, has by its very nature a strong reference to the Redeemer and Deliverer. None but the Prince over all the spiritual kings of the earth, could free all nations from the magic ties of all impure and unholy spirits. The effect of His agency is at once both constraint and liberty, for it is the effect of eternal love, of the divine Spirit.

As the earth, during the polar night, seeks to compensate for the want of daylight by the production of the aurora borealis; so does every nation, impelled by a yearning after Christ, emit, during its night of heathen darkness, some glimmer of christological light. It was from this visionary impulse towards the dawn, that oracles, priests, lawgivers, and founders of religions arose. ‘The nations waited for Him.’

When the sun sets, the stars appear by thousands in the clear sky. If it were possible to conceal for a time from the world the actual life of Jesus, thousands of stars in the heaven of spiritual life would forthwith bear testimony to His image, yearnings after Him, remembrances of Him, promises concerning Him. No sooner does a critic succeed in impressing some circle of credulous enthusiasts with the notion that he has cast a shade upon the sun of Christ’s life in the Gospels, than aspirants forthwith arise by dozens, and offer themselves, as transcending all their predecessors, as founders of new religions, or even as new redeemers, to fill up the supposed vacancy. As counterfeits, they are themselves condemned to testify to the original. And in Christ’s Church, the image of His existence shines all the more brightly and gloriously in the hearts of His people as soon as such eclipses of His name occur.

The sense entertained by the human race of the dignity of prophets, high priests, and kings, is the sense for those exalted gifts of the Spirit which were to unite heaven with earth. Actual endowments, great characters, are the appropriate objects of this sense. From the interaction of the needs of the many and the gifts of the few have these high offices originated, under God’s all-ordaining government. Each of these offices, however, requires

the other, and none of them is perfect till their union and reality are complete. The true prophet must devote himself to the God who makes him the medium of His revelations; but thus he is at the same time a true priest. The priest who offers himself to God as a sacrifice, attains to a resurrection; and in this resurrection is a true king. If, then, the three offices are in their perfection one, no deep prophetic saying can be heard, not a breath of the priestly spirit can be emitted, not a ray of kingly majesty can shine forth, on earth, without involving a reference to the one personality of Christ. It was the obscure and arbitrary longing for the manifestation of this unity of the divine-human life, which led the ancient Roman to the apotheosis of Caesar, and the mediæval Roman to an idolatrous veneration of the Pope.

Thus the deep need felt by human nature to do homage to a superior, to find the depths and sublimities of life and its repose in great personalities, is a general prophecy of the God-man. This general reference to Christ seems, indeed, as yet to furnish no distinct image of the life of Jesus by an indication of any of its definite features. But when we analyse this sense of human nature for a higher personality, we shall perceive highly significant lines, appropriately filling up the general image of the anticipation of Christ.

For, first, this homage-paying impulse is evidently, in the majority of instances, a sense for the worker of miracles, and even for the miraculous. Even the dark world of magic is a mutilated and obscure anticipation of that life, in which the rude materiality of the world vanishes before the brightness and power of the pure spirit, which understands and controls it according to its destiny for the Eternal Word. But when, in their myths, the ancient heathen often represented the great heroes of spiritual life as sons of virgin mothers, conceived under the consecration or by the agency of a divine power, they expressed the truth, that the relations of the divine Spirit to the formation of separate individuals are infinitely various—that there are unhallowed, hallowed, and more hallowed births; and they were also tending towards the supreme, the most hallowed birth, in which spiritual agency and human cultivation, creation and baptism, the process of formation in time and the existence from eternity, were to meet in one.¹

But this sense for the miraculous is merely the sense for the Benefactor, the Deliverer, the Redeemer. There is in human nature an irrepressible tendency to hope for coming deliverers and benefactors. Poetry is full of tutelary spirits, helping genii, or angels. And what are all such subjective representations of angels, but a kind of ‘second sight,’ by which men behold their Redeemer? And just as plainly does a sense for the death of Christ on the cross, and its significance, show itself among mankind. We have already spoken of tragedy. Tragedy recognises the meaning of sin, of the curse, and of the catastrophe; and points to that wonderful

¹ Comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, p. 229; Neander, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 15.

relation in humanity, found to exist almost from house to house, that the innocent should suffer for the guilty, that the noblest heart in every human circle always bears the greatest part of that circle's burden, that the full punishment of a family sin usually falls on a comparatively innocent head. By her representations of minor catastrophes and relative atonements, she leads to the idea of the great universal catastrophe of humanity, and the real and absolute atonement involved therein. Tragedy, in its christological meaning, opposes all those views of history and Christianity which would, with convenient superficiality, steal past the cross of Christ; while man's proneness to be deeply moved and strangely elevated by tragic emotion, shows him to be fitted to experience and to discern both judgment and atonement in the great and sacred sufferings of *one* man. Tragic poetry has not, indeed, been the product of the intellectual life of all cultivated nations, but the need of sacrifice has; and the import of sacrifice has ever been justly viewed in its reference to the import of the death of Christ. Even in those horrible sacrifices which consciousness of guilt extorted from the excited frenzy of the heathen in the worship of Moloch, in the self-inflicted tortures of the fakeers, and in that most deeply degenerate form of the felt need of an atonement, self-murder, may be seen the actings of that spiritual impulse, which entertained the presentiment that dissolution of life would procure remission of guilt before God's judgment-seat; and which, even in its darkest delusions, was tending towards the reality of an act of sacrifice, in which victim and priest, divine decree and human self-surrender, or, in other words, obedience and sacrifice, the suffering of an individual and the suffering of mankind, judgment and atonement, death and victory over death, are miraculously blended.

But if human nature could in its dreams and fictions thus forebode, and in its feverish delusions even rave of, the great atoning death, an obscure notion of a resurrection also could not but run through its mental life and the utterances of that life. Accordingly, we find that all nations have been inclined above all things to doubt the utter death of those great or terrible individuals who have either cheered or disturbed their lives. When Nero died, it was said by both Christians and heathens, that he had only retired into obscurity; the Christians said, he would return as Anti-christ. Of Napoleon it was said, long after his death, that he still was living in concealment, and would one day reappear. Frederic Barbarossa was to awaken and come forth gloriously from the tomb, in which he was but slumbering till the appointed time. In the myths too of the ancient nations, it was through the sufferings of death that heroes attained to the glorification of their lives (*e.g.*, Hercules). But to pass into the sphere of ordinary actual life, let us ask, what does man's dread of death really mean? Is it a merely instinctive feeling, such as is sometimes seen even in the lower animals? Or is it not rather evident, that this dread is the expression of a spiritual feeling, of the indignation and protest of

personal consciousness, against the appearance of dissolution—that it cries for, and proclaims a resurrection in some place or other, while the various degrees of joy which have been felt in death, form an assent to that exalted summit, the victory over death, which the Gospel history records?

Thus is the Gospel history surrounded by many concentric circles, in each of which the actual allusions to this history are either plainly or dimly perceived. Theology, in her relation to these general christological indications, seems still to occupy a position similar to that filled by natural philosophy, when fossil skeletons were taken for *lusus naturæ*. Her task, however, is to learn, like natural science, to infer the whole living organism from its fragmentary remains—the life of Christ from the separate fragments of christological allusion found among the human race. As the musical virtuoso can perceive the theme in almost every separate passage of a good composition, so will the Christian spirit learn to discern, with ever-increasing clearness, the theme of the world's history in all its separate harmonies and discords.

NOTES.

1. The preceding remarks are but an attempt to point out the principal incidents of christological allusion to be met with in the common history of mankind. The thorough working out of this subject cannot but be promoted by the researches of Christian missionaries, and must, in return, be of the greatest importance in the thorough carrying on of missionary operations. Paul at Athens argued from matters granted by his hearers, and by them made ready to his hand. Arguments of a like kind arise from a sense of the general christological allusions found throughout the world. If these allusions are ignored, and mythologies esteemed to be dark to their very foundations,—if the nations are regarded as autochthones, and their religions as mere local superstitions with no allusions to aught besides,—we shall hardly enter into their circle of ideas. The star of the magi, as well as the altar to the unknown God, though too commonly considered isolated instances of subjective combination, are, in this respect, striking New Testament indications of a general heathen Christology, as well as clear directions in missionary work. Is it not evident, for example, that most nations go beyond their merely national consciousness, and express their union with the whole race of mankind in some legend or expectation? In one, some great alteration of circumstances is expected to arise from the East, in another, from the West. Most heathen religions, Mohammedanism not excluded, express a foreboding of their own dissolution. The expectation or announcement of mysterious heaven-sent men, who are to unite heaven and earth, is everywhere prevalent.

PART III.

THE HISTORIC RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

SECTION I.

THE PHENOMENON OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

At the head of the books of the New Testament stand four narratives, which in their relation to literature, to the civilization of the world, to history, to the Bible, to Christianity, and to each other, form but one single phenomenon.

Considered merely as literary productions, they appear as compositions announcing, in a few pages, events, ideas, and doctrines which, as the principles of the Christian Church, were henceforth powerfully to affect, to animate, and to transform the world; compositions in which the humblest pens depict the mightiest matters in clear, simple, and effective strokes, and which have become the centres of a vast, an ever-increasing, and most noble, universal literature.

Secular literature has a thousand times entered into competition with these books in the matter of style, and has, in many instances, exhibited greater distinctness of character, more correct models of narrative, of reflection, of poetry, of discourse. But there is a nobility in the naturalness of the Gospel style, which preserves it in perpetual vigour, while many more refined forms of literature have already become, as far as concerns their original power, obsolete; *e.g.*, the descriptive narrative, the Ciceronian declamation, the machinery of gods and goddesses in poetry. The style of the Gospel narrative is everywhere more distinguished for wonderful conciseness than for copiousness; while with respect to its moral tone, we find ardent zeal manifested with such tranquillity, admiration expressed with such moderation, a sharp and determined opposition to all evil powers, and even to the devil himself, waged with a dignity so noble, that we can easily conceive how these pages have, even in their style, upheld to the world's end the credit of the *New Testament*.

The relation in which the four Gospels stand to secular history is an harmonious one, since they narrate facts which are not only recognized as historically true in their general features, but also fill up a blank, which, but for their presence, would exist in the midst

of universal history, and involve every part of it in obscurity. Not only Josephus, but also the Roman historians who depict the times of Christ, know of His life, His world-famed death—the crucifixion, and its great result—the incipient formation of His Church. Of the inner relations of the life of Jesus, however, of its supernatural elements, they could of course, from their point of view, know nothing.

The four Gospels occupy in the Bible a position midway between the prophetic writings and apostolic Epistles, and are indissolubly connected with both. They form a key to the Scriptures, the loss of which would render them but a closed sanctuary. When a contradiction is sought between the spirit of the Gospels and that of the prophets, or a discrepancy between the Pauline Christ and the evangelic Christ, the judgment must, in either case, have been warped by dwelling too much upon details. Christ, and the everlasting Gospel in Him, is the deep point of union towards which the prophets tend, from which the apostles proceed. The representation of the life of Jesus in the Gospels is in entire accordance with both the theocratic and the apostolic spirit.¹ The apostolic Epistles appear in all their parts as developments, in which the historic Christ of the Gospels is made, by His Spirit, the life of mankind ; and it is from them that we learn to appreciate the genuine and thorough Christianity of the four Gospels. The Evangelists, indeed, are not identical with Christ. They are not perfect. Their communications may be inexact and uncertain in details, as appears from comparing and testing their accounts. But their individual deficiencies are cancelled by the fulness of their totality. They bring forward in their narratives and representations nothing that is unchristian or inconsistent with the general effect of Christianity, though they have been most stringently tested and reviewed in this respect. The accusations which have been brought forward—as, for instance, the history of the Gadarene swine, the cursing of the fruitless fig-tree, and the like—have only served as proofs that the sublimity and refinement of the apostolic feeling for genuine Christianity has not been attained by those who make such accusations. What if Jesus, e.g., had forbidden the devils to enter the herd of swine ? Would it not have been said that He thereby assumed an unusual authority in the land of the Gadarenes?² (Comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 42.) The primitive Christianity of the Gospels is exhibited not only in their abstinence from the fancies of apocryphal fictions, but also in

¹ They who distinguish the religion of Jesus from the religion of the apostles, and again recognize diversities of religion among the apostles themselves, might much more easily discover differences of religion between one town and another, between one village and another, in the province of Rationalism.

² The cursing of the fig-tree has been censured as a sort of trespass in the wood. In this case, the words of the curse must be regarded as an axe or some such tool. Göthe somewhere says, ‘I do not conceal that I curse the people.’ No one, however, withers away in consequence; therefore no blame attaches to him. But this withered tree is brought up against Christ as if He had destroyed it, contrary to the law of the land. (Comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 256.)

their positive contents. The Evangelists had the courage to testify in the world to that great reality of which they were themselves assured. They are Christian because they simply exhibit Christ, the miraculous life in the centre of the world, and because the several miracles appear to them as but its natural result, the slender branches of the strong tree of that divine-human life. But their Christianity appears also in the fact, that they not only preserved His high deeds, but also His deep sayings. Thousands of pious souls would have feared to deliver these mighty sayings, pure and undiluted; e.g., the sayings, 'Love your enemies;' 'If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out,' &c. But the heroic stature of their minds caused them to appreciate the vigour, power, and purity of such wonderful teaching; and trusting to the interpreting Spirit, they despised the pretended offence of the uninitiated, and proved the maturity of their own Christianity by faithfully transmitting them in all their Christian fulness.

Finally, when we consider the relation borne by the four Gospels to each other, we behold a mystery at which criticism has hitherto toiled in vain, and which cannot be fully solved until it is perceived that complete inspiration is so entirely one with perfect freedom of individuality, that the union of various witnesses in testifying to the truth of the Gospel, imperatively requires the most distinct individual diversity in their respective testimonies. This wonderful relation of diversity and unity is expressed in the title of the Gospels: *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, &c. (The Gospel according to Matthew, &c.) In each book we have the same Gospel according to a different individual view. In times when the Christian mind is in a natural and candid frame, the unity of the Gospel will be the prevailing subject of contemplation. It is thus that unprejudiced Christian feeling always deals with the Gospels. In times of more careful examination, diversities will be more closely observed. In times of disbelief, the delusion will be entertained that the diversity is so great as to destroy the unity. It is a very important matter to the military pedant, whether the heroes who are sent into the field wear gaiters of equal length or not! The unity of the Gospels is most strikingly manifested in the fact that even St Mark and St John, the Evangelists who differ the most widely from each other, do yet most evidently announce but *one* Gospel; their diversity in the fact that even St Matthew and St Mark, who the most closely resemble each other, maintain their respective originality. It has, indeed, been recently asserted of St John, that his Gospel does not so much exhibit the Christ of John as John the Christian.¹ But in making this assertion, due allowance has not been made for those dynamic relations which prevail everywhere, and especially in the kingdom of God. If it were true that in the fourth Gospel St John had made himself more prominent than

¹ Compare Weisse, *Die evang. Gesch.*, vol. i. p. 111; [and so, in effect, Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 24, &c., of the Introduction. For a thorough refutation of this opinion, see Davidson, Introduction to the New Testament, vol. i. p. 299.—ED.]

his Master, he would be no disciple of Christ, but an apostate, though an unconscious one, and the founder of a sect of his own. In this case, it might be said of him, in modern language, that he had gone beyond Christ. If St John conceived a more ideal Christianity than Christ, the latter must be degraded into his mere forerunner, and both, to be consistent with truth, must announce this fact. But when St John confesses to finding the whole originality of his Christianity in Christ, it is doing him injustice to discredit his assertion. If, then, Christ is the originator of his views, his representation of the life of Jesus does not essentially differ from that of St Mark. St Mark indeed forms, together with St Matthew and St Luke, a decided contrast to the Gospel of St John: they have a common tone, from which that of the latter is very different. But yet in this contrast the unity of the Gospel is unmistakable. On one side, we have the Son of man, the genuine formation of the Divine Spirit; on the other, the Son of God, the perfect manifestation in the flesh of human nature. There, the works of Christ manifested in rich abundance as the effects of His word; here His words appearing as the great deeds of His life and deciding His fate. There, the light-bringing day; here, the sacred light. The Sermon on the Mount points in truth to the same way of salvation as the discourse with Nicodemus; and the resurrection of Lazarus ranks as the highest fact of the kind with the raising of Jairus' daughter, and of the widow's son at Nain. How identical in all essential respects is Christ's conflict with Judaism in the first three Gospels and in that of St John! If we turn our glance for a moment from the single to the synoptic Gospels, we behold the Christ of St John instituting the Lord's Supper, while in St John's Gospel, *e.g.*, in the purification of the temple, we recognise the Christ of the Synoptists. Diversity is, however, quite as apparent as unity. The Synoptists have a peculiar manner of expression very different from that of St John. They relate, partially at least, the history of Christ's childhood, while St John is occupied with His eternal existence before the world was; and two of them, viz., St Mark and St Luke, narrate His ascension, while St Matthew and St John suffer the Redeemer's person to disappear in a final manifestation of His glory.¹ The narratives of the Synoptists are rich in accounts of miracles, while St John relates such only as are most deeply important as demonstrations of the truth of the Gospel history. The former report such discourses of Christ as cast a light upon the ways of the world² and the way to the Father, or the laws and relations of the kingdom of God in its development; St John, on the other hand, preserves those which relate to the centre of the king-

¹ The aim of St Matthew, in the conclusion of his Gospel, is to depict the Lord, as the Prince of the kingdom of heaven, in contrast to his former delineation of the Crucified One. The conclusion of St John's Gospel concerns the Apostles Peter and John. Hence neither had special occasion to relate the ascension, which they viewed as involved in the resurrection.

² [What Augustine calls 'dicta que ad informandos mores vitæ præsentis maxime valerent.' *De Consens. Evang. i. 5.—Ed.*]

dom of God, the personality of Christ, or the significance of His personality in its relations to God, to the world, and to believers. The synoptic Evangelists narrate the Lord's more public agency and works, the scene of which was chiefly Galilee,¹ and hence for the most part Galilean events : St John relates more especially the prominent features in the development of the Lord's life, and those conflicts, both outward and spiritual, with pharisaic Judaism which were the occasion of His death ; hence mostly scenes in Judea. While the former contemplate chiefly the history, the office, the work of Christ, His ministry and His sufferings in His work, St John collects those incidents in which the spiritual perfection, the abounding love, the kingly glory of Christ are most significantly displayed. Hence his peculiarity not only of form, but also of matter, results from an inward principle, while the difference of matter must also have been increased by the circumstance that John, according to ecclesiastical tradition, had regard to the three former Gospels in the composition of his own.²

Even the three first Gospels, with all their essential unity and similarity, manifest distinct originality in their composition and statements. Each displays its peculiarity in the choice and treatment as well as in the position of incidents. Thus, in every respect, each preserves its independence, its own free and fresh view of the subject. Their similarity, however, in matter, form, and expression is so very evident, that a reader seeking only the religious impression they produce, always thinks he is reading but one writing, one Gospel.

By these remarkable relations have the four Gospels accredited themselves to His Church in all ages, as four great and independent testimonies, strengthened by their very peculiarities, to the life and miracles of the Lord Jesus Christ.

NOTE.

The relations borne by the four Gospels to each other have come under our notice in the present section, though the relations of the Gospels to the Evangelists have not yet been treated of. This subject, as also the distinctive characteristics of the several Gospels, will occupy us when we treat of the criticism of the Gospels. We are here only concerned with what is more immediately evident, viz., that an unprejudiced acquaintance with the Gospels confirms

¹ Hence arise those historical inaccuracies which are a result of the real motive of the composition.

² Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccles. c. 9. [Jerome's words are : 'Sed et aliam (besides the intention of John to refute Cerinthus and the Ebionites) causam hujus Scripturæ ferunt : quod quum legisset Matthæi, Marci, et Lucæ volumina, probaverit quidem textum historiæ, et vera eos dixisse firmaverit ; sed unius tantum anni, in quo et passus est, post carcerem Johannis, historiam texuisse. Prætermisso itaque anno, cuius acta a tribus exposita fuerant, superioris temporis antequam Johannes clauderetur in carcerem, gesta narravit, sicut manifestum esse poterit his qui diligenter quatuor Evangeliorum volumina legerint.' But see Davidson's *Introduction to the New Testament*, i. 320 ff.—ED.]

the following general conclusions concerning their mutual relation :

1. That with regard to their matter, they all form but one Gospel ;
2. That with regard to their form, each Gospel must be considered as a distinctly original composition.

SECTION II.

THE FOUR GOSPELS AS PRIMITIVE RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

The four Gospels, in the form in which we have them, may with perfect justice be pronounced to be credible historical and primitive records of the life of Jesus. They are literary representations presenting us with purely objective testimony ; they are the products of a perfect, and therefore infinitely tranquil enthusiasm, in entire unison with the object which excited it. No secondary motive is found here to create a discord or awaken suspicion. Their form is the result of that entire surrender to the manifestations of the perfect image of God which was one with the most powerful subjective appropriation of the same. The purity with which they reflect, as instruments, the rich and glorious reality of the life of Christ, imparts to their moral aspect a nobility which must ever enhance their credibility. With princely magnanimity do they exhibit the essential, while they touch but very slightly upon the non-essential. They calculate upon receptive, like-minded readers, who can sympathize in their homage to what is heavenly and essential. Their very inaccuracies in non-essentials enhance the sublimity and trust-worthiness of their announcements. They seem to have been incapable of anticipating that critics might form their inaccuracies into a plea against the credibility of their evangelical testimony. Many a friend of the Gospel may have felt vexed that the Evangelists have not shown more lawyer-like exactness, for the sake of such observers as would take kings and emperors for beggars, if they met them in homely garments. But they themselves seem to have been, in this respect, very proud, or rather very free from care ; and their carelessness may well be regarded as their noblest credential. They addressed themselves to the sincere minds of their fellow-believers, with a plain testimony according to their own views and most assured convictions, and delivered the treasure to them ; on the other hand, they gave, by their sublime negligence and with a bold generosity, a portion also to that lawyer-like glance which is ever searching into statements to find erroneous views and contradictions. But how well does that portion of history which they describe as its central point fit in with universal history ! This very fragment completes general history, clears up its obscurity, disentangles its intricacies, explains the curse resting on the world, and reveals its destiny. Thus these books are the most peculiar, the most universal of documents. They form also one-half of the New Testament, fitting into the other half like the severed halves of an apple. Christianity,

moreover, recognises in them her primitive sacred records. By all these relations they are continually receiving fresh authentication, as well as by the relation in which they stand to each other.

With respect to this mutual relation, the manner in which they corroborate each other recalls the poet's words :

‘ Kennst du das Haus, auf Säulen ruht sein Dach.’¹

In our days an effort has been made to support the assumption that these four evangelic testimonies must of necessity cancel, or at least mutually weaken, each other. The contrary is, however, evident, viz., that by their mutual relations they attain the stability of an immovable edifice. For the relation between their discrepancies and accordances is so unique, that we are again and again forced to view them as four independent testimonies to one and the same thing; and, consequently, to each other. The wonderful nature of this connection, and its preservative effect, have not yet been sufficiently appreciated. It may be compared to the resisting force of a forest when maintaining itself against the storm. A tree standing alone is easily bent and broken by the wind, while a tree in the midst of a wood is kept upright by the common strength of the whole group. Thus do the four Gospels support each other in the sheltering neighbourhood of the other books of the Bible. Ordinary criticism offers the best proof of this fact. If a critic, for example, would attack the Gospel of St John, he tries to obtain help in this enterprise by acknowledging the authenticity of the three first Gospels. Thus, however, the Gospel of St John is but confirmed by means of its inward relation with the acknowledged books. At another time, the attack starts from the assumption that the Gospel of St John is the genuine record of the Gospel history, and the discrepancies between this and the synoptic Gospels are made grounds of suspicion against the latter. But even in this case, the effect of coincidence is too powerful : if St John is genuine, their matter is, in all essential points, authenticated. Again, St Matthew and St Luke are taken up, to the prejudice of St Mark. But the latter is so firmly rooted in matters common to all, that any peculiarity is but the greater proof of the independence of his testimony. If, on the contrary, St Mark's is made the primitive Gospel at the expense of the other two, these each present peculiarities, and at the same time furnish complementary matter of sufficient importance to establish their respective originality, while by the matter which they have in common with St Mark, their authenticity is abundantly corroborated. These general remarks obtrude themselves on our notice when we contemplate the Gospels in their mutual relations as primitive records of the life of Jesus in presence of modern criticism. Criticism may try their authenticity, and in this way raise doubts requiring to be entered into in a thoroughly circumstantial and scientific manner ; it may find a multitude of difficulties in separate passages, especially in the discrepancies between the Gospels ; but

¹ Comp. Irenæus, c. Hœres., lib. iii. c. 11.

when it tries to overthrow any one Gospel, as a whole, by means of another, it misconceives their strong and mysterious connection, and does but prepare its own defeat. The unity and conclusiveness of the Gospels are of so divine and intrinsic a nature, that all uncandid criticism must be discomfited in its misconception of this essential glory; while they are so human in their external form, and in their peculiarities, that they seem themselves to invite us to test their statements by the light of fair and candid criticism. Thus are they ready to answer all kinds of criticism; and their cause is so pure and sublime, that it can but gain by every fresh inquiry. Nay, it is their property to give birth to true criticism, and to condemn false criticism to the death it deserves.

NOTE.

The four Gospels seem like a delicate web of truth stretched out to catch all unfair criticism. They entangle all such criticism in its own inconsistencies. Or we may compare them to a wondrous grove of trees forming an enchanted forest, in which the unclean spirit of profane criticism gets lost and entangled, and wanders about restless and perplexed, unable to find its way. This magic power is exercised by the four Gospels, because the single history of the life of the Lord Jesus, which they furnish, is presented under the different aspects of four widely differing and typically significant individual views. This fourfold reflection of the one light of the world, when viewed askance, presents a thousand dazzling reflected lights, completely confusing the vision, while a direct view of the four reflections shows but *one* light. In this respect it may be affirmed, that the mutual relation of the four Gospels more excites and evokes the criticism of the human mind than anything else, and at the same time becomes itself the criticism of all false criticism. Who would undertake to harmonize the results of modern criticism? A harmony which should seek to bring these critics into accordance with each other, would find a thousand times more difficulties than those harmonies which seek to reconcile the discrepancies between the several Gospels. The well-known lines, referring to the government of the celestial powers, may with a slight variation be applied to the four Gospels:—

‘Ihr führt die Kritik ins Leben ein,
Und lasst die Arme schuldig werden;
Dann überlasst ihr sie der Pein
Denn jede Schuld rächt sich auf Erden.’

PART IV.

CRITICISM OF THE TESTIMONIES TO THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECTION I.

GENERAL SURVEY.

THE Gospel history is, in its very nature, a criticism of the world—a test of the world by the absolutely correct standard of its eternal destiny, which is manifested in Christ. It is a sentence passed upon all other lives, upon the assumption of the truth of the divine-human life. And in communicating itself to, and implanting itself in humanity, it diffuses a life which is essentially critical; it originates a critical examination, not only of the world's worth, but also of its own merits. Thus it is in the nature of the critical agency of the Gospel history, that it should evoke an antagonistic criticism on the part of all those whose points of view it subordinates or opposes. The philosophy, however, of Christian consciousness, with respect to its conviction of the certainty of Gospel history, must be ever more and more developed by the dialectics of this antagonistic criticism, and thus an evangelical criticism of the Gospel history arises. This criticism, on its formal side, institutes tests by which the Gospel history is to be tried, while, on its material side, it undertakes a scientific examination of the nature of the Gospels, and of the Gospel history.

SECTION II.

THE GOSPEL HISTORY AS CRITICISM.

No one acquainted with Christianity will deny that it has appeared in the world as a criticism of Judaism and Heathenism. Speaking generally, this critical agency has been exercised by its spirit, but it is the Gospel history which has chiefly and definitely exhibited this spirit. This is the condemnation, *the crisis*, that light is come into the world (John iii. 19). Christianity being then in its nature critical, must neither be accepted, maintained, nor defended in an uncritical manner. Why callest thou Me good? said Christ to the

young ruler, who acknowledged Him with superficial precipitation, and proceeded to test that enthusiastic follower by the remark: Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay His head. The prejudiced criticism which Nathanael opposed to faith in Christ was treated with marked forbearance; the sceptical criticism with which Thomas doubted the resurrection, with considerate and convincing patience. Christianity cannot commit its cause to rash and blind enthusiasts, nor to thoughtless and fanatic champions. It would communicate itself to the world, not in mere dead precepts, but according to its own nature, that is, as the spiritual life of the world; therefore it calls upon men to test and examine its contents. It would entirely liberate man, and reconcile him with God; it would therefore especially liberate and reconcile his understanding. It would further become, through the Spirit, the presence of eternal life in the Church; it therefore presents to the subjective spirit no absolutely closed and rigid external historical tradition. It was by the prompting of the Spirit that the Church was to recall all that Christ said and did (John xiv. 26). Christianity will itself be the instrument by means of which man is to judge, to comprehend, to renew, all that is in his world; hence it requires even of man's conscience, that he shall be so thoroughly convinced of its spiritual truth as not to prejudice its interests by his own uncertainty and want of harmony. 'Thou canst not follow Me now,' said Christ in this sense to Peter. From its very nature, Christianity is willing to stand the critical testing of every mind, that it may rest entirely upon its own statements. The Gospel history would be received and appropriated in a critical spirit, because it is itself the criticism of the spirit.

NOTE.

'Criticism' is spoken of in our days as if it were an infallible intellectual organ, a new science, religion, or authority, demonstrably and definitely present somewhere. But this assumption involves part of the monstrous superstition with which modern morbid idealistry is infected. In this vague sense, criticism is now this head, now that; perhaps the head of one under the delirium of fever, of a madman, perhaps the head of a rogue. In a more temperate decade, the critic, instead of uttering the spell, Criticism pronounces! might perhaps have said, This is my humble opinion! or, This is the proof which convinces me! As long as the criticism of an individual is contented to appear as the subjective activity of his own mind, it must be allowed to speak, and should be listened to with a respect proportioned to the reasons it exhibits. But as soon as it is spoken of as a power, the critic must either be able to describe its principles, its rules, its organic form, or clearly express his desire to be regarded as an incarnation of the critical spirit. In the latter case, we should know what to think of him. It is very remarkable that the assumption that some kind of incongruity exists

between Christianity and criticism, has for a long time been considered a valid one. Is not Christianity criticism? Is not its spirit pure and mature truth, manifested in and corroborated by universal history? Does this spirit need assistance, in its expressions and dealings, from the rude, shallow, obscure spirit manifested, it may be, in single individuals, and more or less entangled, as it still is, in nature? The assumption that pure truth must be freed from its shell of Christianity by the help of criticism (a consummation to be effected by the intellect of the natural man, with its philosophical implements), is in direct opposition to the Christian assumption. The legitimacy of this assumption is meanwhile still confirmed, in opposition to all the false messiahs of criticism, who are, so far at least, right in entirely separating their power from that of Christianity, or of the Gospels. The result will show from which side the criticism arises; but in any case the theologian is too easily deceived, if he from the first grants the title of 'criticism' to the new intellectual powers which would test the Gospels.¹

SECTION III.

ANTAGONISTIC CRITICISM IN GENERAL.

Every disposition appears under the form of a judgment passed on others by him who is the subject thereof. Ill-humour at the wet weather calls the weather bad. The ill-humour of the child at its father's refusal calls the father unkind. The reproofing and correcting agency of Christianity upon the world calls forth much ill-will, and this ill-will settles into antagonism, and expresses itself in antagonistic judgments. This antagonistic criticism was already full blown during Christ's sojourn on earth. His miracles were criticised by the accusation that He cast out devils through Beelzebub; His teaching, by the complaint that He seduced the people; His life, by the declaration that He was glutinous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. The first work which united the several antagonistic opinions of this kind into one general criticism was the crucifixion of Jesus Himself.

The agency of antagonistic criticism in the world cannot be extinguished till all the dispositions contrary to Christianity are annihilated; in other words, it must, in conformity with its nature, last as long as the world does. With reference to its form, however, it changes its garb according to the fashion of the age in which it appears. In a rude age, it will in round terms declare the Gospel history to be an imposition; in a frivolous age, it will use the weapons of ridicule; and in a philosophical age, it will assume an aspect of philosophic repose and inquiry. It may, however, even in this guise, be distinguished from true criticism by the following

¹ [Cf. the admirable introductory chapter of Neander's Life of Christ, and also the chapter entitled 'Criticism a Necessity,' in Ebrard's *Gospel History*, Clark's Translation, 1863.—ED.]

marks. First, being founded on subordinate principles, it will necessarily proceed upon them. Secondly, since it cannot possess a genuine interest in the eternal ideal reality manifested in the incarnation of the Eternal Word, because it is in principle opposed thereto, it will, as a result of the oblique impulse it has received from its false principles, be driven to subreptions. Thirdly, being unable to avow its rejection of the Christian principles of the Gospel history (since it would appear in its examination of this history as an agency inherent in Christianity, and friendly to it), and being unwilling to commit itself to the recognition of those principles in their results, it will mingle in a hateful manner operations which seem to recognise the principles of the Gospel with such as deny it. A history of ‘criticism’ would consist of a series of such proceedings, beginning with unconscious self-deception, advancing to subtle special pleading, and terminating in utter perfidy.

SECTION IV.

ANTAGONISTIC CRITICISM IN ITS SUBORDINATE PRINCIPLES AND ASPECTS.

Considered as a history of the facts in which the Godhead was united with manhood, the Gospel must be regarded as a spiritual and intellectual height lying far above the principles, dispositions, and insight of Heathenism or natural religion. Wherever, then, natural religion is in any way active, or even opposes the agency of Christianity, its principles become the principles of an antagonistic criticism, and these principles appear in definite forms and expressions.

When Heathenism is regarded as the religion of nature in contrast to the religion of the Spirit, it is generally viewed chiefly on that side by which it would find the divine directly in nature, identify it with her and worship it in her. In this case, Heathenism is viewed in its piety, in its superstitious exaltation, in its deification of the creature. But in this manner it is not fully comprehended, and still less are its real roots appreciated. For this superstitious piety stands in polar interaction with a deep-lying impiety ; and the monstrous superstition which it exhibits, is founded upon a monstrous unbelief. The self-chosen idol of the heathen only attains its magic splendour by more or less undeifying the world which is exterior to it. Its fame is surrounded and borne up by the sphere of the profane. And even when the heathen multiplies his gods, when his world seems in his eyes everywhere radiant with divine glory, he only attains to this multiplication and partition of the divine in nature by making general matter form the dark, unspiritual background which scatters all these lights, and in its gloomy power rises above and encloses them. In a word, Heathenism cannot get free from the eternity of matter : it wants the knowledge of a God who, in His eternal and spiritual light and power, is self-possessed,

self-determined, and self-comprehended ; who ordains, creates, and governs the world ; whose eternal power and wisdom call it into existence, and before whose majesty it vanishes. Its divinity is limited and restrained by the dead matter of a world whose existence seems too real, too mighty, to allow its profane independence to be utterly surrendered in the beginning of the world, to the glory of the Father, in the midst of the world, to the glory of the Son, at the end of the world, to the glory of the Holy Ghost.

Even heathen consciousness cannot indeed mistake the superiority of the Godhead to the ever unspiritual, material world. It views this superiority, however, under various aspects, according to the various forms of its own life. First, the heathen looks upon the Godhead with the drowsiness of his own natural religious passivity ; and in this case he beholds it everywhere appearing, and everywhere disappearing in the mighty process of the material life of nature. Matter is to him the absolute darkness into which it sinks and from which it again emerges in the many gods, or in the *one* idea of universal divinity. This is the pantheistic stand-point. But then a moral sorrow, and indignation against the power which matter seems to exercise over spirit, are excited within him : he cannot endure that the Divine should be thus carried down the dark stream of natural forces, and tries to make in his own mind a separation between light and darkness. To this, however, he can never attain without making the God of light supreme over all. This god seems to be the Almighty Creator of the world. But in his inmost nature that eternal darkness, which the heathen mind cannot separate from deity, already exists and prevails. Hence his creation is more passive than active, a pathological incident ; and as his life is developed, the darkness which lay at its root becomes more and more prominent. Darker and still darker worlds and structures are its manifestation. This is the ancient emanation-doctrine of the contemplative Oriental. It views God as the bright Father of light, the world as His dark offspring. Modern Pantheism, on the contrary, makes the divine nature arise, by an entirely opposite form of emanation, from the dark foundation of the material universe, as the result of the moral effort of intellectual power. Here finally the Divinity appears Deity, the result of the saddest process of mature human consciousness, the bright offspring of a dark mother.¹ Pantheism, whether ancient or modern, fails to recognise that Holy Spirit which rules the world, and transforms it into the sanctuary of the eternal God.

In the emanation-doctrine of Pantheism is seen, however, a transition to that separation between the light of spiritual life, and the darkness of natural life, which Dualism completes. Dualism is the moral effort of the heathen to free his God from materialism. He excludes matter from his notion of God, and thus forms the conception of an immense and mighty struggle between material light and material darkness. He now calls the light Good, the good God. But he is obliged also to define evil as the evil God, because to

¹ [See the reference to Feuerbach in Part I. sec. i. p. 34.—ED.]

him it is eternal matter of a dark kind, which the good God finds opposed to Himself, and which He can indeed restrain, but not annihilate. He can restrain it, because it is matter, and therefore weaker than spirit ; He cannot annihilate it, because it is eternal and substantial. It is from this religious point of view that the heathen fails to recognise in God the Almighty Father.

He has, however, begun to recognise in the moral and powerful God, the Being who governs the material world, restrains what is evil therein, arranges what is formless, and, by continual decrees which penetrate to the material as laws, forms all into an orderly creation. In this perfected creation, God appears indeed in super-mundane, but not in intra-mundane glory, because He is viewed as only subduing by conflicts and victories, and restraining by iron laws, a world originally opposed to Him. Matter, in its subjection to law, is indeed no longer the darkness which overwhelms the Divinity, nor the evil which resists Him, but it is the rigidity which limits Him in the full manifestation of His glory in the world. Such a view of divinity is a mutilated Monotheism,—it is Deism, which cannot recognise the Son of God, or God in the glory of His Son.

Thus we have discovered three heathen principles subordinate to Christianity, which are capable of becoming the principles of a criticism antagonistic to the Gospel history. In the history of religion, there is, however, a continual interweaving of these different principles of Heathenism, especially of Pantheism and Dualism. These contrasts, like all contrasts of a morbid kind, formed in a spurious element common to both, run to unnatural extremes, and often reconcile their differences by overleaping each others' boundaries, and by mutually intermingling. The various forms of the emanation-system form the border land, in which this mingling of Pantheism and Dualism takes place. The emanation-system is ever oscillating between the decision which calls what is natural, evil, and that which calls what is evil, natural.

Mutilated Monotheism, on the other hand, keeps itself more or less aloof, in form at least, from these two extremes, which are so closely allied with it by a common heathen basis, by recognising God as a spiritual power raised above the world, and ruling its darkness by imposing laws upon it. In its essence, however, it partakes of both extremes : it is pantheistic, because its universe possesses a life properly its own, separate from God, ever conformed to laws, and so far divine ; but on the other hand, it is also dualistic, inasmuch as its rigid conformity to laws would force the eternal God to behold inactively, and in super-mundane quiescence, the mechanism of those laws of nature which He had Himself ordained.

From the commencement of Christianity to the present day, these two principles, viz., that of dualistic Pantheism, as well as that of pantheistic but still more dualistic Deism, have asserted themselves against the principles of Christianity ; and the results have appeared

in a long parallel series of productions on the part of antagonistic criticism.

It is, however, self-evident, that these principles can only appear in their unmitigated form outside the Christian Church. Wherever they have intruded within it, they must have been more or less christianized. They were broken by the power of Christianity, but were, even in their mutilated condition, tenacious of existence, in proportion as they had taken up some of the elements and powers of the Christian faith, and had strengthened each other by becoming mutually interwoven, and consolidated into compounds.

It was in the Graeco-Romish Heathenism, or in Persian Dualism, that the purely extra-christian forms of pantheistic Dualism chiefly opposed Christianity. Its modified and semi-christian forms have been principally developed in Gnosticism, Manichæism, Spinozism, in the Bohemian theosophy, in the earlier system of Schelling, in the Hegelian philosophy, and in its critical offshoots. The wholly extra-christian phenomena of dualistic Pantheism have manifested their opposition to Christianity in Talmudism, in Mahometanism, and, in modern times, in Materialism. Its christianized forms have appeared, in the ancient Church, in Ebionitism and Monarchianism; in the modern, in Deism and Rationalism.

The criticism which the Gospel history experienced on the part of unmixed pantheistic-dualistic Heathenism, appears in the martyrdoms of the first centuries of the Church, and in the literary accusations and works by which this persecution was accompanied. The Church first experienced this antagonistic criticism on the part of the prevailing pantheistic Heathenism, in the persecutions which it underwent from the Roman power; and afterwards on the part of the prevailing dualistic views, in the martyrdoms encountered in the Persian kingdom.

The dualistic principle, however, was gradually introduced into the Christian Church, and was constrained to appear, within this sphere, under a maimed and modified form. It is under such a form that we behold it in the system of the Gnostics. The essentially distinctive mark of Gnosticism is overlooked, when its relation to the Church is lost sight of. It exhibits a series of systems, misconceiving the pure ideality of creation, and hence the Old Testament; and therefore incapable of believing in the manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh, and equally incapable of forming a society in separation from the Church; or in other words, of exhibiting a powerful embodiment of their ideas. It is the latter circumstance which makes these systems Gnosticism. The climax of Gnosticism is Manichæism, which under various disguises glides through the middle ages, and finds religious seriousness, in its morbid form of melancholy, the congenial soil in which its old and scattered seeds will always spring up. The system of Spinoza seems to present the greatest contrast to Manichæism, exhibiting, as it does, the entire dissolution of this morbid dualistic effort. But even in this case the existence of one extreme cannot but testify to that of the other. The acts of the

Divine Being are, according to Spinoza's views, utterly pathological; this Being, in His constant torpor, is resolved into His attributes, or into the incidents of life—a dark fatalism alone gives Him any existence. But the dualism in question reappears in its most decided form in the system of Jacob Böhme, and, by its means, pervades even to our own days, though under various and ever-increasing disguises and refinements, the more modern idealistic and philosophic view of the universe. It is seen in the obscure unfathomableness from which Böhme makes the being of God emerge, and comprehend Himself in the Son, as in His heart; so that in this self-comprehension He is first called God, 'not, however, according to the first *principium*, but cruelty, wrath—the stern source to which evil bears witness, pain, trembling, burning.'¹ Its course is next traced in the earlier system of Schelling; evil being therein regarded as that higher power, inherent in the dark groundwork of nature, which comes forth in actual life; its necessity being asserted, and the contrast between nature and spirit, between darkness and light, viewed as the contrast between good and evil. According to Hegel also, the ideal is in a state of declension in nature; the absolute, the natural condition of man is evil, the creature has an unhappy existence. Finitude, humanity, and abasement are said to be identical, and are considered alien to that which is simply God, and, as such, destroyed by the death of Christ. The exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God is regarded as an explication of the nature of God returning to Himself, of God as spirit. This spirit manifestly gets rid of individuality as something alien, because it can still only view it as a product of nature, which is said to be the self-alienation of the ideal. Even Hegel's opinions concerning physiognomy, prove that he did not comprehend the importance of individuality. He views it as finitude, limitation, deficiency; hence spirit must get rid of it to be reconciled with itself. But is it not the very opposite of deficiency, even that infinite definiteness of spirit, which is a condition of personality? This Manichæan shadow forms also that philosophical obscurity, that warped and dualistic principle, which is found in Strauss's Life of Jesus, and by which the several conclusions of that work are explained. Here the dualistic separation between the ideal and reality is a chief premiss (see pp. 89 and 90). From this premiss arose that brilliant phrase which was one day to attain to world-wide celebrity, as a test of the absence of presentiment in religion, viz., that it was not the custom of the ideal to lavish its fulness upon an individual and to be niggardly towards all others. According to this saying, individuality is at best but a stronghold in which the ideal is confined, and whence it cannot come forth, till, like magic powder, it has burst its prison-walls. Hence it cannot be raised to the pure ideality of the spirit, nor pervaded by its fulness, because the boundary lines which circumscribe the individual, are still regarded as limitations of the spirit. This is the most refined attainment, the highest effort of

¹ See Baur, *die Christliche Gnosis*, p. 560.

dualism ; hence its necessary complement must be Pantheism, which regards the universe as a foaming ocean, and beholds its God involved in its ceaseless tides.

The assertion that the rites of the ancient Hebrews were a worship of Moloch, has been maintained with ever increasing boldness.¹ The truth is, that the Hebrews had to maintain a continual struggle, by means of the revelation and law of Jehovah, who as the eternal God stands opposed to the process-God, in order to free and purify themselves from heathen traditions of the worship of Moloch. Jehovah commanded Abraham to offer up Isaac ; he was willing to make the sacrifice ; but, in the decisive moment, he understood the command as if Moloch had said to him : Slay Isaac. Then Jehovah interposed, praised his obedience, corrected his error, and taught him the difference between the two acts, *surrender* and *death*,— bidding him slay the ram as a sign that he surrendered, i.e., sacrificed, his son. Abraham showed not only by the *strength of mind* with which he responded to the voice of God when commanding sacrifice, but by the *clearness* with which he understood the voice of God when explaining sacrifice, that he was the elect one, whom the Lord had need of for the founding of a theocracy, in which the life of man was to be continually sacrificed to Him, but in which no human being was to be slain through guilty priesthood. Thus the Old Testament gained a victory over the worship of Moloch, in the case of Abraham, though it had still to resist and subdue the back-sliding of the people into this false religion. And how can this backsliding astonish us, when we see that philosophy has not yet succeeded in entirely freeing itself from Chronos, when it still considers it the highest attainment of the religious spirit to regard individualities as sacrifices, which must fall before the process-God ? This Pantheism cannot endure even the idea of the God-man, of the pure consecration of the divine-human consciousness merging itself in the eternity of God. If Christ be comprehended as eternal personality in God, it is manifest during time that God has ever been comprehended in Him as personality. If this God-man performs miracles, what is this but manifesting the entrance of higher and still higher circles and spiritual forms into the old world ; exhibiting the government of God in the foundation and centre of the world, and thereby abolishing the assumption that the Divinity is ever lost and ever found again in the ever uniform course of things ? The world then ceases to appear an endless stream ; it discloses itself as the wondrous flower, in whose blossom may be discovered the eternity which brought it forth. The dynamic and organic relations of the world's history, according to which Christ forms the deep centre, the outweighing counterpoise to the whole human race, and regulates the whole course of the universe as its stable centre, according to which He elevates glorified humanity, as His one Church, to the eternity of His spirit, are relations of a sublimity unattainable by

¹ Daumer, *der Feuer und Molochsdienst der alten Hebräer*; Gillany, *die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer*, and others.

the view which makes the greatness of mankind to consist in its masses. It is also incapable of understanding Christ's death upon the cross in its moral significance, as the reconciliation of the world, arising from the voluntary surrender of Christ to the justice of God, and can only regard it as an event naturally developed in the series of necessity. But the resurrection is the rock on which Pantheism suffers shipwreck. That spiritual and divine heroism, that sense of eternity, that inspiration of personality, which shows its consciousness of its eternal dignity by testifying to the certainty of the resurrection, lies far above its conceptions. Its spirit arises from rashness, and proceeds to rashness, over that Faust-like magic bridge of subjective life which it hastily constructs, and again destroys. That such a view of the world should seek, with all the energy of its nature, to destroy, by a critical attack, the actuality of the Gospel history, lies in its very nature. Christianity, however, finds this criticism criticised by the unspirituality of its principles. A philosophy not yet freed from the worship of Chronos, cannot sit in judgment upon the history which put an end to the sway of Zeus. But that this formerly vanquished view of the world has been able to attain a relative authority in our days, must have been caused by the morbidity of the view of the world prevailing in the Church. If Christian theology and the Christian view of the world have misconceived the omnipresence of God in the world, and resolved God's elevation above the world into a terrible and abstract absence from it, the rise of the opposite extreme is thereby sufficiently explained. When, further, the ideal, the general, was ever more and more lost in the single facts of the Gospel, and these were regarded as mere past and isolated facts, which faith was to preserve as historical dicta complete in themselves, it was a just retribution that Pantheistic criticism should, on its side, no longer acknowledge the actuality of the Gospel ideas. This criticism, however, has attacked not only false views, but the Gospel history itself, and has in this respect itself become the criticism of its own deficient and antiquated principles.

Mutilated dualistic Monotheism, under the form of the Jewish hierarchy, brought about the crucifixion of Christ, because it was perplexed by a Messiah, in whom the fulness of the Godhead was united with a real, a poor, and a homely human life. Talmudism subsequently carried on this criticism, and expressed itself by defamation of the Virgin¹ by abhorrence of the 'executed One,' and by a deep hatred of the Gospel in general. Even Mohammedanism criticised Christianity, especially the doctrine of the Trinity, from the point of view of a deistical faith, assuming the abstract unity of God, His exclusive super-mundanism and super-humanism, and the self-contained absence of His being from the world.²

¹ Compare Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 227.

² Compare Gerock, *Christologie des Koran*, p. 74. The Koran assumes that, according to Christian teaching, Jesus, and Mary His mother, were placed as two Gods (Allahs) near to Allah (Sura, v. 125).

Deism also was forced to modify its expressions concerning the personality of Christ, and the Gospel history in general, as soon as it entered and took up a position within the Church of Christ. Ancient christianized Deism, as chiefly implanted in the Church by converted Pharisees, appeared under the form of Ebionitism, which denied the eternal glory and deity of Christ, opposed His miraculous conception, and looked upon Him as the actual son of Joseph, while it honoured Him as the last of the Old Testament prophets, the reformer of Israel, endowed with the largest measure of the Spirit for the execution of His work. Ebionitism in its Jewish narrowness gradually fell, like a withered branch, from the tree of the visible Church ; but the Deism on which it was founded continued to agitate the ancient Church under forms more elevated and profound. It appeared in the whole series of Monarchians, who had this common feature, that they all denied the essential Trinity of the Godhead. They embraced, like Noëtus, the doctrine of Patriconianism ; or, like Sabellius, the doctrine of a merely triple form of manifestation ; or, like Arius, a new development of Polytheism,¹ rather than plunge into the depths of the doctrine of the threefold glory of God. In other words, they could not free themselves from the deistic view of the abstract unity of God.

This Deism is also perceived in the system of Nestorius,² so far as the latter misconceives the ideality of the human personality of Christ, prepared for throughout the whole history of the human race ; while the opposite systems of Eutychianism and Monophysitism could not attain to the full recognition of the human reality and historical truth of this personality, and were consequently perplexed by Gnostic errors. Nestorian as well as Gnostic notions have in disguised forms been secretly amalgamated with Christian views, especially with such as regard the incarnation of Christ as merely a part of His humiliation, and consider it solely as a positive arrangement of God with a view to the redemption of mankind.³

This abstract Monotheism took a more philosophic and definite form in modern Deism, which is for this reason more definitely so called. The deist looks upon the universe as simply nature, as a work of God, separate from Himself, purely natural, and self-sustained. He considers that God, in His omnipotence, caused the existence of the world to depend upon that conformity to law which he imposed upon it ;

¹ In church histories of Arianism, Arius indeed, as a believer in subordination, is represented as opposed to the Monarchians, but it is easy to perceive that subordination well agrees with monarchy, especially the subordination of Christ with the monarchy of God.

² The Nestorian terms, *συνάρφεια* and *ἐνοικησίς*, to define the manner of the union of the divine and human natures, express the immediate and merely external meeting and union of the two natures of Christ. Adoptianism also belongs to the same group.

³ If it were agreeable to Christian truth to look upon the incarnation of Christ as part of His humiliation, His exaltation must consequently be either represented as depriving Him of humanity, or as obscured by the continuance of His humanity. The passage, Phil. ii. 7, *έαντὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν ἐν δούλωματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος*, does not designate the incarnation of Christ abstractedly viewed, but the definite historical circumstance thereof, that He took upon Him the form of a servant, that He became like unto (sinful) man, as His humbling Himself.

that He so strictly bound it to a rigid conformity to law, as Himself to seem constrained and limited by the constraint He had laid upon the universe. In this system, conformity to law usurps the place of God's active government, and seems to be a second deity, separate from Him, and causing Him, while reposing in that absolute supra-mundanism which is the celestial counterpart of a monkish renunciation of the world, to leave it to the perpetual correctness of its own movements. As, however, conformity to law cannot really work as a second divinity, a divinity in the world, it rather becomes, in the religious consciousness of the deist, a shadow obscuring the living God, a partition separating from Him. This evil result cannot but follow from the fact, that the universe, even in its motions, is seen by him under a narrowed, an impoverished, a mutilated form. It is not the actual world, with its infinite variety, its continual progress from lower to higher grades of life, its refined and spiritual conformity to law, agreeably to which the ordinary appearances of the lower spheres of life are ever being broken through and laid aside, amidst miraculous phenomena, by the principles of the higher spheres of life, which furnishes him with the facts upon which his theory is formed. His view rests, on the contrary, upon a compendium of natural philosophy, which has elevated the elementary principles and definitions thereof to eternal statutes. It confounds these statutes of a dead compendium with the living laws of the world, the formula which designates the phenomena with the phenomena themselves, empiricism operating upon common every-day remembrance with the infinite objective reality. The deist is specially taken with the false assumption, that the development of the world exhibits a single æon, ever moving onwards amidst unvarying results, as upon an interminable railroad between an inconceivably distant commencement, and an as inconceivably distant termination. He does not form a conception of progress from æon to æon in an advancing series, resulting from the introduction of higher, deeper, and richer vital principles, and least of all, of the appearance of that principle, in the midst of time, which eternalizes temporality and transforms the restless course of his unending line into the solemn movement of a circle returning upon itself. The shortsightedness, prejudice, and enmity with which Deism has, on its subordinate principles, criticised the facts of Gospel history, are well known.¹ In modern Rationalism it has striven to ennable itself, has taken a more Christian form, and has endeavoured to make better terms with the high reality of the Gospel history. But Rationalism, too, has radically failed, because the inconceivability of the abstract monotonous unity of the Godhead, the necessity of the Trinity in Unity, the living light of the personality of God in its self-manifestation, have not yet risen upon it. Hence, in its interpretations of Scripture, and delineations of the life of Jesus, it

¹ English Deism, in its practical results, viz., critical attacks upon sacred history, was specially introduced by the sensualistic philosophy of Locke. Comp. Lechler, *Gesch. des Engl. Deismus*, p. 154, &c.

has ever employed a criticism more or less betraying an Ebionite point of view.

So early as in the days of the Apostle John, the influence of these extraneous heathen principles was manifested in the critical opinions uttered against the heavenly reality of the divine-human life of Christ. The apostle proclaimed the deity of Christ, in opposition to incipient Ebionitism (1 John iv. 15); the truth of His humanity, in opposition to incipient Gnosticism (1 John iv. 2). But compounds, especially the system of Cerinthus, soon resulted from the elective affinity of these extremes. Such compounds are continually reappearing, and frequently reappeared.¹

In our own times, the Gnostic element, under the form of modern culture, has shown its old critical antagonism to the great ideal reality of the Gospel history in Strauss's *Life of Jesus*; the Ebionite element, under that of modern scholarship, has expressed the same antagonism in the *Life of Jesus* by Paulus. The work of the former has, indeed, assimilated many elements belonging to the latter stand-point; indeed, the latest productions of antagonistic criticism can scarcely be reduced to any, not even to heathen principles.

An intelligent view of the principles of antagonistic criticism exhibits their connection with those dark powers of heathen natural life, which Christianity criticised, *i.e.*, sentenced and conquered in the Gospel history. If they regain any influence within the Christian Church, notwithstanding their former overthrow in their original forms, this is a consequence of special compounds and relations in the sphere of spiritual life. A venerable and respectable Pharisaism will often obtain consideration in the presence of rank Antinomianism; while, again, the idealistic spiritual aspirations of Gnosticism will gain fresh favour when orthodoxy stiffens into mere lifeless precepts. The facts of the Gospel history had long been treated by the Church in a rigidly positive manner, and regarded rather as dead marvels than living miracles; their vital power, and innumerable vital relations, being misconceived,—their ideality, unappreciated. It was ordained that the stiff rigidity in which the living pictures depicted in the Gospel history were held by such a view, should be broken up by the electric shock of a partial and Gnostic treatment.

NOTES.

1. The common principle of every possible product, both of naked extra-christian Heathenism, and of broken and christianized Heathenism, is ungodliness, impiety: impersonal Atheism, with respect to the subjective view; Materialism, with respect to the objective appearance. Atheism trembles to admit that solution of the problem, the government of God in all reality; hence its product is materialism, the unspiritual substance. Materialism is the

¹ Philo may be cited as an example. As an Israelite, he could not be a complete Gnostic; nor, as a Platonist, a complete Israelite. By his assumption of the eternity of matter, he stood below the Old Testament, while thinking to stand above it.

refuse of the world, heaped up before the door of indolent atheism. The measure of the one is the measure of the other. The heathen system, to be understood in its specifically heathen character, must be viewed on this side, viz., that of its impiety. If, on the contrary, it is viewed, as is usual, only in its piety, which, as a morbid and superstitious piety, corresponds with its impiety, it is difficult, fundamentally, to refute it. For example, it is not so easy, when contending with the fire-worshipper, to dispute the beauty and magic power of fire, as to show him how erroneous it is to regard water as a God-forsaken mass. The temple-worshipper feels, when within his fane, a divine awe ; it is, so to speak, the asylum of his delusion ; it is in its profane environs that the Erinnys of criticism must attack him. The pantheist feels himself happy in contemplating that divine afflatus which breathes through the universal ; but he must be shown that he is unhappy in the presence of that great glory, the majesty of the eternal conscious Spirit, whose ever-powerful and conscious unity makes the universal, abstractedly considered, vanish into nothing, as the same Spirit had called it forth from nothing. It must be proved to him that his system, in wanting a definite God, the eternal spiritual consciousness of God, has too little of God ; that it has not, as seems to have been sometimes thought, too much of God. The deist boasts of maintaining the unity of God. But if he is forced to acknowledge the absolute darkness which lies in the notion of an abstract unity of God, and also to confess the blackness of darkness proceeding from the rigid mechanism of an universe left by God to its own laws, he is on the road to recognise that the unity of the Eternal Spirit cannot be conceived of, in its vitality, without the form of Trinity.

2. Gnosticism has this peculiarity, that it can only form schools and not churches, because it knows only morbid ideals, which can never become flesh and blood ; a transient summer of the divine, which can never become the sun of the personal Deity. Its chief characteristic is antagonism to the accomplished realization of divine government. Hence the Gnostic systems also must be simply viewed and arranged according to their polemic relations to the Old Testament doctrine of creation, to the real advent of Christ in the Old Testament, and to His incarnation in the New, and according to the development of these relations. Consequently, even Manichaeism must be regarded as only a potentialized Gnostic system. With regard to Gnosticism in general, the thesis may be laid down, that there is no pantheism which is not completed by dualism, no dualism which is not completed by pantheism. The pantheist finds the existence of an evil being, first, in general finity ; next, in human sensuousness ; then in the sacred lines of Individuality, which distinguish man from man ; and lastly, in the human feeling of dependence, *i.e.*, in religion. Dualism is continually betraying its pantheism, by its inability to maintain the precise line of demarcation between the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness. Darkness comes forth in the kingdom of light, and the lost germ of

light is again sought in the kingdom of darkness ; this confusion is the sign of that pantheistic somnolency which overcomes the heroic efforts of dualism.

3. Every form of deism has the peculiarity of regarding the existence of the world as a trivial reality, as the great *tout comme chez nous*, which need not be surrendered to the all-ruling Godhead ; while Gnosticism makes the actual world a terrible sacrifice, to be consumed upon the altar of the ideal, like sin itself ; nature, a declension from the ideal ; individuality, limitation ; the features of the countenance, a caricature of the spirit, haunting the world ; personality, the selfish Sunday child which will not accommodate itself to the perpetual process of the dialectic railroad ; the historical Christ, the ideal niggardly of its abundance, the ideal in oppressive majesty ; and, lastly, the Gospel history, the high land which opposes a granite-like resistance to that stream of idealistry, which is to wash down everything, and will not in its Vulcanic character surrender itself to the process which would convert it into one of the sedimentary deposits of mythology.

4. As the vampire is said to be nourished by the blood which he sucks from the living sleeper, so does dualism derive its triumphs from the blood of the Church herself, when she has fallen asleep over her riches. If, for instance, the ideality of the Gospel history had been always duly estimated, its reality could never have been so sadly misconceived ; and if its reality had been more powerfully proclaimed, criticism could not have attempted to convert its ideality into scraps of wonderful New Testament grammar. Dr Paulus' view of Gospel history is done away with by Dr Winer's New Testament grammar. If the real grammar can do so much for the ideal theology, how much more must the real theology be able to do for it !

5. The warning of the Apostle Paul, Col. ii. 8, applies here : *βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ο συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν.* *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς.* Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, (through the philosophy, namely, which is formed) after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ (which does not look upon Christ, but upon elements, atoms, matter, as the principle of the world). For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (in the unity of the bodily appearance). For so would I translate and explain this passage.¹ Thus the apostle is contrasting, with all earnestness, the philosophy founded on the assumption that the elements are the principle of the universe, with the philosophy which recognises Christ as the principle of the universe,

¹ [Virtually the same interpretation is given by Tertullian (*De Præscrip. Hæret.* c. 33) : ‘Apostolus, cum improbat elementis servientes, aliquem Hermogenem ostendit, qui materiam non natam introducens deo non nato eam comparat, et ita matrem elementorum deam faciens potest ei servire, quam deo comparat.’ But a full consideration of this and all the other passages which bear upon the Gnostic heresy will be found in the *Bampton Lectures* for 1829.—ED.]

and that, not as if delivering a discourse, but speaking of it in its proper meaning, both in a Christian and speculative manner. This philosophy arose from human, *i.e.*, heathen tradition, and did not overcome heathenism. It was, at first, rightly called philosophy, as being the sincere effort of the human mind to attain to knowledge; but now that it would maintain itself in opposition to the philosophy which is after Christ, it becomes vain deceit. And they who would impose it upon Christians spoil them, deprive them of the infinite riches laid up in Christ, and chiefly of the certainty that in Him the fulness of the Godhead, and the most decided individual corporeity, are become one. While Christian philosophy—which is not mere philosophy, because it goes beyond abstractions, and presses on from life to life—recognises Christ as the eternal principle of the universe, this miserable philosophy, which makes Christians poor, looks upon the elements as the principle of the universe. Here, then, we find the matter of the heathen view of the world resolving itself, before the eye of the philosopher, into atoms or elements. These float before his view like dark *mouches volantes*, which he cannot perceive to be caused and arranged by the ideality of the great and spiritual principle of the universe, and are seen, in consequence of a defect of spiritual vision, in mutual interaction with the so-called ‘dark seed’ of sinfulness, especially of moral spiritual bondage. The ascetic precepts of the teachers of error at Colosse (Col. ii. 16, &c.) showed that they were founded on Gnostic, consequently on dualistic principles. These precepts, too, are *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κοσμοῦ* (Col. ii. 20; Gal. iv. 3, 9); and correspond with the theoretic assumption of world-forming *στοιχεῖα*. The profane sense, which looks on the world as profane, must be brought back by the strictness of the precept to a feeling for what is holy, that it may discover the principle of the holy, that principle which both theoretically and practically sanctifies the world. By this allusion, the apostle seems to have been led to designate even the Israelitish precepts as *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κοσμοῦ*.

SECTION V.

ANTAGONISTIC CRITICISM IN ITS DIALECTIC DEALINGS.

An interest in Christianity is an interest in reality itself, and therefore one with the spirit of truth. True Christianity knows nothing of partiality. The history of the apostles gives repeated instances of this Christian elevation of mind; *e.g.*, in the narratives of the ruin of Judas, the fall of Peter, the deceit of Ananias. The cause of Christianity is therefore never served by deceitful arguments. But neither can it be with truth attacked continually from opposite stand-points. One distortion may contend with another for ages; inhuman Christianity and unchristian humanity, monkery and philanthropy—phenomena which contain their own refutation—may for a long time contend with each other,

but one aspect of pure truth cannot oppose another. Consequently, when Christianity, as realized truth, as incarnate ideality, meets with a consistent negative criticism of its records, it may be expected that the fallacy of the antagonistic principle will soon develop in a secret tissue of fallacy in the execution. Modern antagonistic criticism cannot conceal this feature. An unprejudiced criticism of this criticism cannot but more and more bring to light the thread of special pleading, running through all its operations. Such a method of proceeding has indeed been frequently provoked by the equally morbid partiality, with which Church theology has endeavoured to reconcile the discrepancies of the four Gospels. When Church notions pursued their course without opposition, the doctrine of inspiration was carried to such an extreme, that not only the whole Bible, but every letter of the Bible, was made a Christ of. The infallibility of the four Gospels was viewed as excluding every uncertainty and inaccuracy in each single narration. One result of this false assumption was the so-called harmony, *i.e.*, an attempt to bring all the Gospels into perfect agreement with each other, even in minute details. But harmony shot beyond the mark. The false assumption led to a false execution, to artifices in exposition which were carried to the extremes of special pleading. Church theology, however, was punished for the faults committed by this well-meant harmony, by a three times more powerful antagonistic harmony. The presumption, that as the commemorative saying is repeated in lyric poetry, so what is most important in history may also be exactly repeated, as, *e.g.*, the cure of the blind at Jericho, the purification of the temple, may always be pleaded in favour of the former harmony. Antagonistic harmony, on the other hand, has laid down terrible canons.¹ The Gospel narrative must, above all things, be in harmony with ordinary reality. If the fact it relates has a glimmer of ideality, if it inclines to the miraculous,² if it is pervious to the ideal, and thus symbolical, it is therefore suspicious.³ This applies especially to the ethic sublimity, the moral and religious dignity, with which the Gospel history exhibits its facts.⁴ It is the superiority of the Gospel history to the ordinary reality of com-

¹ Compare Ebrard, *Gospel History* (Clark's Tr.), p. 47, History of Harmony. Ebrard has well shown that Strauss proceeds upon the principles of an exaggerated harmony, antagonistic to the Gospel history.

² 'God acts upon the world as a whole directly, but upon its several parts only by means of His agency upon other parts, *i.e.*, by the laws of nature.—The miracles which God wrought for and by Moses and Jesus, are not emanations from His direct agency upon the whole, but presuppose a direct action in particular cases, and are, so far, in opposition to the ordinary type of divine agency in the world.'—Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 97.

³ Certainly truth must be the foundation of a universal anticipation and notion; yet this truth will not consist of a single fact exactly corresponding to such a notion, but of an idea realized in a series of facts often very dissimilar to such a notion.—*Id.* vol. i. p. 237.

⁴ As neither an individual in general, nor the commencing point in an historical series in particular, can be at the same time archetypal; so, if Christ be regarded decidedly as man, the archetypal nature and development which Schleiermacher ascribes to Him, cannot be made to accord with the laws of human existence.—*Id.*, vol. ii. p. 749.

mon life which, according to antagonistic criticism, makes its historic truth suspicious. Facts consequently increase in improbability, in proportion as they surpass the circle of the empirically natural, the real, and the commonplace. The second harmony which this criticism requires, is the agreement of the several Gospel reporters in the details of their narrative. The Gospel records are to bear the impress of lawyer-like exactness, and to prove themselves to be protocols, stating the external facts of circumstances, with perfect care as to the reception of detail. And in proportion as they want the qualities of protocols, as they fail to give to matters the form of a judicial process, are they to be regarded as untrustworthy.¹

The first of these requisitions fundamentally denies the very principle which makes the Gospels, gospels. For they have not to relate facts which can be easily fitted into the empiricism of the Adamic aeon, but the facts of that new principle of ideal-real humanity, whereby the miraculous breaks through the old sphere of nature, the eternal and spiritual light shines through human corporeity and reality, the majesty of perfect righteousness appears in the reality of a human life—a life surrounded by a retinue of moral heroes whom it calls into being, contending with the demoniacal powers which oppose it, and savingly and judicially pervading the old and sinful human nature with its effects. If the weak mind, giddy and stunned by such an announcement, betakes itself to crossing and blessing before this principle and the heroes it produces, it is at liberty to do so; but when it finds fault with the details of that which is so miraculous, symbolical, and holy, it is committing itself to the criticism of the principle, while deluding itself with the idea that it is but criticising the accounts of its operations. This critical requisition for the agreement of the Gospel narratives with the old empirical reality, the true critic will, as a Christian, feel bound to reject.

But the second requisition he will reject as a historian; for it would either drive every genuine historian to despair by its results, or, on the other hand, hinder him by its absurdity. This demand ignores from the very first the fact that the Evangelists are relating history, and therefore a series of facts, which, having been already reflected in the subjective spiritual life of the narrators, can no longer be had in the form of an abstract chronicle, nor converted into one. It falls into the further error of forgetting that the Evangelists relate religious history; a history which they did not compose and arrange with a view to the requirements of the sci-

¹ Compare Tholuck's *Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Gesch.* p. 438. The author is humorously enumerating the canons upon which Strauss's *Leben Jesu* is founded. The fifth is called 'The Castor and Pollux canon—in which the one of two contradictory narratives by its very existence excludes the other, and is in its turn shaken by the rejection of the other.' Even the agreement of two Evangelists is not to defend the credibility of their statements. Both Matthew and Luke affirm that Jesus was born at Bethlehem, and yet the critic, from the sum of their statements, obtains the result, that Jesus was not born at Bethlehem, but most probably at Nazareth. Vol. i. 327.

tific, but of the religious interest, nor propagate for the furtherance of a partial scientific knowledge, but rather for the purpose of communicating to others, or at least of increasing in them, that same life which they had themselves found in these facts.¹ Finally, this requisition misconceives that which is most important, viz., that these narrators relate Christian history, and therefore facts which in their very nature could not but assume a fresh aspect in each mind according to its individuality, while they yet remain the same, because they are the facts which are to transform the general life in the individual, as well as the individual in the general. The historian must not fail duly to appreciate the co-operation of the historical spirit, especially of the religious spirit, nor finally of the Christian spirit; first, in the original facts of the history; and secondly, in the manner of its narration. He must not be condemned to write merely the history of nations, when he is chiefly concerned with heroes, and even with the greatest heroes; and if he is to understand the circumference of history, he must be allowed to grasp its centre, and to contemplate it from this point. The sway exercised by this false premiss over the works of antagonistic criticism is expressed in a mass of separate sophistries, whose connection therewith does not always at first strike the eye. Arguments are often pleaded before the bar of Gospel criticism which would not pass uncensured, much less prevail, in any civil court. Some practices have already become standing figures. Among them, for instance, is the plan of considering the Evangelists stupid, by understanding their words in the most literal manner, and assuming that they were incapable of intentionally narrating anything paradoxical, imaginative, or symbolically significant. Thus it is asserted that Luke, the disciple of Paul, makes the Lord, in an Ebionite sense, declare the blessedness of the poor, as simply poor;² that John puts a false word into Andrew's mouth, when the latter says, 'We have found the Christ,' since he did not purpose to seek the very person of the Messiah;³ that the Synoptists make the Redeemer give a hint to the Pharisees not to regard Him as the descendant of David, by asking them the question, how David could call the Messiah his Lord (Ps. ex. 1) if He were his son (Matt. xxii. 42; Mark xii. 36; Luke xx. 41).⁴ This

¹ 'It is well to observe that we have not before us a history of religion, but a religious history.'—Gelpke, *die Jugendgeschichte des Herrn*, p. 2.

² Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 640.

³ Bauer, *Kritik der evang. Geschichte des Johannis*, p. 46.

⁴ Weisse, *Evang. Geschichte*, vol. i. p. 587. According to this view of the passage in question, Christ gave the Pharisees a clandestine intimation of His origin by giving them to understand that He was not descended from David. Such an intimation would assume a very intimate relation between Christ and the Pharisees; it would further assume that the Pharisees already took Him for the Messiah, and also that He believed they would esteem Him to be the Messiah, even if they perceived from His intimation that He was not the son of David; and finally, that the Messiah could not descend from David, because the spirit of prophecy had already repudiated this notion in the psalm. How can so many follies be put *at once* into the mouth of Him who ever spake that which was right, for the sake of making 'an *aperçu*?'. The 'aperçu' is, however, quite good enough to slip into some half-dozen theological works.

plan is, however, reversed as occasion requires, and now it is the critic who undertakes the part which the Evangelists have just been made to play: now he cannot form a notion of their meaning, can often find no connection in their compositions, or finally, only some lexical connection, *i.e.*, a word in one Gospel saying reminds the Evangelist of a similar word in another Gospel saying, and induces him to report it. Thus the lexical, *apropos*, the worst of all, is said to be the reason of many of those transitions in the Scriptures which have for many centuries appeared to the Christian mind the most subtle product of inspired thought during the apostolic age.¹ At length, however, antagonistic criticism comes boldly forward with its pretensions to an infinite superiority to the Evangelists. One is praised—he is said to be highly poetical; a second and a third are censured—their words strike the critic as strange; a fourth is branded as a designing, glaring, unholy writer, a coarse falsifier of what is sacred, and condemned as a criminal. It is in the latter position that St John stands with respect to the critic Bruno Bauer.² Thus does antagonistic criticism, which seemed to begin its task in so cool and tranquil a disposition, and with such entire freedom from assumptions, finish by taking up its genuine position, and exhibiting that passionate moral and religious abhorrence, in which it takes a final leave of the Gospels. Such a termination manifests the nature of its origin and progress, and exposes the moral vein running through the whole process,—the antagonism of its principle to the personal incarnation of God, and its holy results. Bold and direct assertions and coarse accusations form the appropriate climax of its procedure; for a false principle ever follows up its other practices with effrontery sufficient to complete their work.

NOTES.

1. A collection of examples illustrating the sophistical dealings of antagonistic criticism might here be adduced, to complete the proofs already given. We would, however, refer to the principal works in which such examples are plentifully given and fully examined, and to the numerous examinations of them. Tholuck, in his often cited treatise, has repeatedly pointed out the sophistry of Strauss's work. With regard to the special treatment of the history of Christ's childhood, examples of the kind in question are

¹ The proposition may be laid down as a principle, that in every production of criticism the critic is comparing his own standard with the subject to be measured, his sense with the sense to be estimated. All criticism is so far a contest, nay, a wager. The critic, in the pride of his intellectual power and authority, says, *e.g.*, of such a passage in the Gospels: I do not understand this passage. In this case, either the Evangelist must be far below him, or he must be far below the Evangelist. But if at last he gives it as his decided judgment, This is only a lexical connection, what is this but uttering the exclamation, *va bane*, with respect to the book criticised? The credit either of the book or of the critic, with respect to religious and moral intelligibility, is now destroyed.

² See Bauer's *Kritik der ev. Geschichte der Synoptiker und des Johannes*, vol. iii. p. 185.

brought forward in my essay, *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter der kanonischen Evangelien*. The most striking specimens must, however, be sought in the criticism 'which goes beyond' Strauss. Certainly 'criticism,' in its last stage, has become the *partie hon-teuse* of modern science.

2. There are many who, in the field of theological discussion, and especially of scientific criticism, entirely repudiate such a proceeding as 'putting to their consciences' the results of their inquiries. This strange decision, rightly understood, exhibits the intention of setting up a scientific priesthood whose dicta are by no means to be impugned. For the very essence of priesthood consists in the separation between the moral character of the individual and the spiritual calling which he fills. The spiritual calling is thereby made a spiritual *métier*. The ecclesiastical priest declines having his discourses 'put to his conscience'; the scientific priest declines to have the result of his inquiries referred to the roots of his opinion, his moral principles. A consistent man, on the contrary, would feel it an offence if his scientific work were not regarded as the product of his mind, and in agreement with his conscience. He would look upon it as an honour, that the moral significance of his conclusions—their relations to the deepest interests of the heart, to the highest principles of the life, should be recognised, and that his works should be regarded as the acts of worship arising from his personal religion. According to the Christian principle, that the inner life must possess a unity of character (Matt. vi. 22; Jas. i. 8), the Church must, once for all, repudiate the recognition of this priestly dualism, which would make the man of science as distinct from his works as the butcher is from the animal he slaughters. Even modern philosophy opposes this violent separation of the intellectual and the moral man. Kant rebuilds the whole world of knowledge, which he had destroyed as resting upon itself, upon the solid foundation of the conscience; Fichte makes the deciding Ego the very centre of gravity in the sphere of knowledge; Hegel finds everything, and especially religion and morality, in the reasoning power. With such premisses, how is it possible to protest against the relations of the reason to the conscience? It is only possible in the cowardly stage of antagonism. When the disease reaches the stage of effrontery, it openly avows the connection of its critical operations with its enmity to Christianity.

SECTION VI.

ANTAGONISTIC CRITICISM, IN ITS INTERMIXTURE OF CONTRADICTORY ASSUMPTIONS, AND OPPOSITE MODES OF TREATMENT.

When the Gospels are viewed from the above described pre-christian and inter-christian stand-points, it will unquestionably be only a natural exercise of the mental powers to test and oppose

them. And the more openly the general antagonistic principle has been expressed, the more fair and honest will the attack appear.

Nor can the right, and even the duty, of every man to test the Gospel records, according to his power and calling, from a Christian point of view, by bending them to conform to certain axioms as to form and matter, and judging them accordingly, be questioned. With respect to their form, inquiry must be made how far they are self-consistent, in accordance with each other, and with the known character of the times to which they refer. Whatever discrepancies appear, will be taken into account; for while their credibility, in the essential matter, would be weakened by essential discrepancies, it can only be strengthened by non-essential ones. The essential matter may be defined as the narration by each Evangelist according to his idiosyncrasy, of the Gospel only, that is, the history of Jesus in its religious significance and effects. The requirements of the axioms of Christian criticism as to matter will be that the Gospel narratives should be homogeneous with the essential definitions of the Christian view of the universe. The general Church view of the God-man, of His life, ministry, death upon the cross, resurrection, and ascension, must form the principles, according to which the matter of the Gospels will be tested. These axioms instantly bring to light, e.g., the difference between the canonical and apocryphal Gospels;¹ and where they lead to the discovery of weaknesses, failings, and blemishes in evangelical narratives, their decision must be followed, regardless of consequences.

Criticism is fully justified in taking either of these opposite points of view: the antagonistic, or that arising from the Christian view of the world. But matters are changed when they are deceptively and obscurely intermingled. When criticism calls the annihilation of Christian theology, Christian theology; and, while professing to proceed only according to the principles of formal criticism, will, in the midst of the argument, admit of none but those antichristian axioms from which it originates, thus rushing with pitiable duplicity from pretended advocacy into decided antagonism, it has even more reason than Wallenstein to exclaim, ‘The ambiguity of my life accuses me.’ A procedure might indeed be imagined, which should exhibit a combination of the two points of view, without falling under this reproof: An individual might write a criticism of the Gospels from some one or other religious feeling of his own, in which, from the very first, he would have regard only to the relation in which the consequences of the Gospel history would stand to the dicta of this feeling. In this manner, every one who approaches the Gospel history, enters into a process of exercising his criticism upon it, and in his turn experiencing its criticism of himself. The philosopher may, if he will, criticise the ‘Gospel’ in detail, according to his professed system. He is not expected to

¹ Compare Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit*, p. 106; Ullmann, *Historisch oder Mythisch*, p. 181.

judge it by any other than his own. But it will better become him to betake himself to principles, than first to lose himself in the discussion of particulars. A criticism of the Gospels, however, professing to be theological, or, in other words, to be mere criticism, naturally leads us to presume that it will judge of the Gospels according to their own premiss, viz., the truth of Christianity. Upon this ground only has it a right to enter into matters of detail; such, e.g., as the religious consciousness of Jesus at His twelfth year, the spirit of His farewell discourse, &c. But if it seeks, from the first, to demolish this premiss, attacking it in its details on every opportunity,—if, from the first, it suffers non-Christian axioms to regulate its proceedings,—it forfeits all claim to indulgence in particulars, and all pretence of judging and testing the Gospels in that Christian spirit which, as such, should judge and test all things. When once the antagonistic relation is admitted, this complication disappears. The discussion is then carried on in the sphere of religious philosophy, and outside the gates of the sanctuary. Internal questions, such as the connection of the Gospels, which only the Christian spirit can solve, and which must remain hidden from non-Christian views, are no longer discussed. It will then be regarded as even unscientific to enter into particulars with adversaries who contest principles. Modern antagonistic treatment of the life of Jesus should have been answered by dogmatism. If a lawyer had been commissioned to reply to the sophistical analysis of the details of the Gospels, how easily might a lawyer-like reply have been found to these lawyer-like attacks! Nay, perhaps, a master of his art might, in conducting the cause of the Evangelists, have succeeded in exhibiting, in the style of their adversaries, a connected protocol out of all their several accounts. This much is, however, plainly manifest from the above described intermixture of critical starting points, that theological criticism, as such, is still in its infancy, and that the first step to be taken, should be an attempt to develop the principles of criticism itself, to bring the instrument into conformity with its ideal, that it may not be employed as a mongrel kind of proceeding, between judicial execution and private assassination, in an uncertain and destructive manner, producing nothing but the most perplexing illusions.

NOTE.

The two well-known titles—*The Life of Jesus* critically treated—and *Christian Doctrine exhibited in its historical development*, and in its opposition to modern science—have often been mentioned as characteristic indications of such an intermixture of opposite critical points of view. The compositor would have more accurately exhibited the peculiar relation between what is acknowledged and what is denied in these titles, if his italics had distributed the emphasis thus: *The Life of Jesus, critically treated—Christian Doctrine, &c., in its opposition to modern science.* The title, ‘The

Lord' seems strangely introduced in the critical works of Bauer, in the midst of an attempt to consign to destruction the glory of His works. In the third volume, indeed, it gradually disappears, and the name Jesus takes its place.

SECTION VII.

THE CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL CRITICISM OF THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES.

A course of argument which proceeds upon no definite principles, or upon principles not decidedly those of the Christian point of view, can by no means be brought forward or recognized as theological criticism. Many works making pretensions to this title, have been characterized by their denial of the principles of Christianity, the principles of historical criticism, and even the principle of being consistent with themselves. Every utterance and evasion of subchristian or antichristian assumption, every sophistry and chicane employed in the examination of the Gospels, has been called criticism. To lay down an organon of criticism, is therefore of the first necessity.

It has been laid down as the first principle of criticism, that it should be entirely free from assumption. Freedom from assumption has even been said to be criticism. Hence a more accurate definition of this notion may reasonably be demanded. The requisition that the critic should not allow himself to be influenced by preconceived opinions, is quite another from that which demands that he should not start from Christian premisses. The saying is, however, too indefinite to settle anything satisfactorily. This freedom from assumptions is never found as a gift of nature, for even the most mindless of men has his interests. If he has no holy, he has unholy interests, because he is a man, a being whose inner nature can never sink or stiffen into absolute indifference. The most indolent exhibit some kind of party spirit, and even the despairing are destroyed by the fearful power of false assumptions. It is only when moral and religious development has reached its climax, that a kind of energetic freedom from assumptions can appear, which is then, however, identical with the most sublime assumption. For it is not till man clearly recognizes that pure reality is identical with truth, that he attains the courage and gladness which enable him to look upon the facts he is investigating in a purely objective manner, and to perceive that truth will gain most by an utter renunciation of the selfish interference of his own special interests, by a complete surrender to the divine, in its naked reality. Thus man does not become free from assumptions till he assumes that truth appears in reality. But this is, in fact, the assumption of the eternal truth of Christianity; namely, that the ideal is realized, not merely in myths, but in facts; that the God-man must be manifested, not merely in scattered reflections, but in the plenipotence of individuality and personality. It is in this fundamental dogma that Christianity appears as the religion of the spirit. Hence Christianity is identical with objective

criticism, and the Christian spirit, as such, is free from assumptions, because it consists in the highest assumption, and *vice versa*.

Absolute freedom from assumption then, is, in the relation of a vital contrast, one with absolute assumption, and this contrast, in its oneness, forms the chief principle of Christian criticism. Its results are not merely a series of absolute critical propositions, but of absolute critical acts. Partial freedom from assumption, on the contrary, is more or less unconsciously connected with the partial assumption, that a perpetual schism exists between spirit and nature, between truth and reality, an abyss between Godhead and manhood, which can only be covered over by artifices on the part of either. Hence it looks upon reality as a world infected, in its very nature, with illusions. This low-pitched and false assumption begets, as has been seen, a criticism after its own kind. The first principle of true criticism, however, is the conviction that the actual world unfolds truth, and that truth is exhibited in facts, the highest truth in the highest fact. Hence arises the general requisition, that the critic should test the matter in hand with a morality corresponding to this conviction. He is seeking truth in the object he is testing; he must therefore approach it with truth. Generally speaking, truth is the absolute connection, the conformity of the particular with the whole, and with the infinite. But in the province of criticism, truth exhibits itself in a definite succession of incidents. First, the speech or expression is self-consistent; this is its logical truth. Then the saying is consistent with the inner nature of the person speaking; this is its moral truth. Further, its conformity with already accredited testimony is apparent; this is its historical truth. Finally, the saying is in accordance with the Eternal, as manifested in the heart of every man, and expressed in the life of the holy; this confirms its religious truth. In all these respects, it cannot but be required of the true critic, that he should himself be in accordance with truth, that he should be truthful, or 'do' the truth, as St John expresses it, in order to pass judgment concerning the truth of the matter to be tested.

Thus what criticism demands in its object, it must first exhibit in its own transactions. It must be true, to be able to demand, to appreciate, and to recognize truth. Criticism of the Gospels demands of the Gospel which it is testing, first, that it should be consistent with itself. The Evangelist may indeed, nay must, *appear* to contradict himself. For the *appearance* of contradiction is the mark of life, depth, and concrete vigour. Nature *appears* to contradict herself a thousand times. If the critic finds a difficulty in this *appearance* of inconsistency, if he requires of the Gospels a lawyer-like accuracy of expression, he does but proclaim his own inability to appreciate them. He may, however, and must expect them to be free from real contradictions. The measure of their logical consistency is but the measure of their credibility. Such a consistency is the first demand of the critic. But it is therefore also his first duty. If he contradicts himself,—if, for instance, he at one time

designates the dulness of the narrative, and at another its picturesqueness, as tokens of its unhistorical nature, if he at different times applies different and mutually opposing rules of judgment,—he forfeits all claims to the credibility which he seems in search of.

Logical untrustworthiness may be the result of enthusiastic delusion. It may, however, be connected also with moral untrustworthiness. Detailed testimony always makes a moral impression : the person who speaks is always apparent in the background of the speech. It may be perceived from the relation of the whole to the parts, whether the highest degree of conviction prevails, or whether the speaker is endeavouring to persuade himself as well as others. When, then, logical inconsistency appears, on closer observation, to be moral inconsistency,—when, for instance, a hesitation between the dictates of holiness and immoral opinions is apparent,—the moral trustworthiness of the speaker is doubtful. The critic examines him in this respect. He may condemn him if he betrays a decided inconsistency between his isolated sayings and his moral nature. But he is himself subject to the same law. If he is continually showing himself prejudiced, while laying down as a principle entire freedom from prejudice,—if, e.g., he insists on seeing anecdotes in myths, or myths in anecdotes, while it is the nature of the anecdote to give prominence to the occasional, and of the myth to express the general, if he applies different weights and measures to different passages, according to the requirements of his special judgment,—the spirit of the critic has become his possessing demon, which is powerfully rending him in the midst of the process.

In communications of a historical kind, criticism investigates their historical truth by considering their relation to already admitted testimony. Historical truth must, first of all, be distinguished from the truth exhibited by a legal document or a protocol. The latter must exhibit the utmost completeness in the description of an event, the former a lively and spirited view and condensation of it. The legal reporter endeavours to transcribe an occurrence with the greatest possible accuracy, though even this cannot be accomplished without the co-operation of the mind's interpretation. The historical narrator, on the contrary, draws a free and artistic portrait of the circumstance ; he tries to exhibit its essential features, as they have mentally affected himself. History is the actual world viewed and exhibited in the element of the mind, of enthusiasm, of the ideal. A protocol-like history will never descend to posterity ; it is only by means of the joint testimony of the ideal that pictures of the world's history can retain their brilliancy to the world's end, and to eternity. This peculiar nature of historic truth seems to make history utterly uncertain, and does make it uncertain to every man who is only susceptible of the kind of evidence furnished by natural science. But that which makes it uncertain in this respect, is the very circumstance which, on the other hand, constitutes its certainty, viz., the epic spirit with which it is allied. The human mind obtains its highest conviction, concerning such distant and

ancient occurrences as are narrated to it, by epic, or, as it might with equal propriety be called, moral assurance. History does not, however, therefore become a mere subjective delusion. The objective credibility of historical testimony is one of the most unshakable convictions of the human mind. But the relative degrees of this credibility form an endless multitude of historical paths, which entangle the uncandid mind like a labyrinth, while the candid mind finds the brightest traces of truth to guide it. The relative degrees of certainty correspond with these relative degrees of credibility. There are certainties of ancient times, which shine through all time, like the stars, nay, like the sun and moon in heaven. But as soon as the particular features of facts generally certain are treated of, the particular views both of the witnesses and the recipients of their testimony are apparent. The general historical image appears under infinitely various modifications, according to the position and disposition of the minds that perceive it. The Thirty Years' War assumes one colour in the eyes of the Protestant, another in the eyes of the Catholic. The Englishman talks of the battle of Waterloo, the Prussian of the battle of La Belle Alliance ; it is *one* battle, but each nation has its special interest in the more defined conception and description of it. If, then, different stand-points produce different views of the same occurrence, the essential and non-essential must first be distinguished, unless all historical truth is to be despained of. But not only will the view formed of an event depend upon the spirit in which it is contemplated, but this view will be also infinitely modified by differences in the means by which knowledge of it is obtained, by the circumstances of nearness or distance, and especially by the individuality of those who consider it. The variety of historical images which the same event will impress upon different individuals will, however, be the more striking in proportion as the event itself is, on one hand, more important, ideal, and significant, and, on the other, as the individuals who report it are original and significant. But among all varieties of outline and colouring, the historical narrative must, when tested, present in all essential matters the same image as other accredited testimony presents : this is its historic truth. The critic must require historic truth in a narrative. But to require this, he must possess the historic sense. He must have the ability of being assured of distant events by means of the historic spirit ; the power of transposing himself into the past by means of the perpetuity of moral divination ; and sufficient delicacy of perception to discern between the objective matter of a narrative, and its subjective setting. If this sense is wanting, he will either, with superstitious submission, identify all the witnesses of a fact with the fact itself, and thus, *e.g.*, make out of two different representations of one occurrence, two separate histories ; or he will, with historical incredulity, require that history should be everywhere accredited by its lawyer-like accuracy, that its truth should be officially and juridically established.

Finally, since the Gospels announce that which is ever valid in

the sphere of religious life, the facts which they relate must correspond with the religious consciousness, in those respects in which it is in all ages alike. The critic may and must test the religiousness of the narratives as well as of the facts. Hence arises the necessity that he should address himself to his task in a religious spirit, with a sense for the holy and the eternal in mankind. But the religiousness of the Evangelists announces itself as Christian in its nature. Does it become the critic then to test such witnesses, nay, the facts themselves which they narrate, with respect to their Christianity? Such a task seems both difficult and dangerous. But yet it was once accomplished by the primitive Church, when consciously forming the canon. In this case, the standard is always the collection of the New Testament Scriptures, as formed by the mind of the Church into a definite unity; or, in other words, the Christian spirit as originally and normally defined by the Sacred Scriptures. It is, for instance, entirely in accordance with a due relative subordination, that the Christianity of Mark, the disciple of the apostles, should be tested by the Christianity of apostolic teaching. But the critic who should feel himself called to this examination, must, on that very account, be a Christian. If he is deficient in Christian faith and spirit, he is deficient in the spirit of criticism—of criticism at the climax of its glory. These are the principles which the criticism of the Gospels must always cultivate and develop, and it is according to their dictates that its work must be carried on.

PART V.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

SECTION I.

THE CHURCH'S CORROBORATION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS IN GENERAL.

ONE of the noblest branches among Church traditions is the tradition of the four Gospels. It appears in a threefold form : first, as testing and accrediting the Gospels, and investing them with ecclesiastical validity ; then as preserving, propagating, and expounding them ; and finally, as laying them down as the rule and touchstone of the Christianity of all other ecclesiastical traditions. It is only the first form of this tradition which will here engage us, viz., the corroboration furnished to the four Gospels by the ancient Church.

Three stages may be discerned in the progress which this corroboration exhibits. First, we find that, even in the middle of the second century, four Gospels, far surpassing all others in authority, were known to the Christian Church. Then we learn from witnesses of the latter half and close of the same century, that the Gospels, known as the four Gospels, must have been the same that have been handed down to us ; while towards the close of the third and commencement of the fourth century, we find these Gospels in possession of full and decided ecclesiastical recognition.

Justin Martyr (A.D. 165) and his disciple Tatian may be taken as representatives of the position in which the Church stood to Gospel literature. The former was born in Palestine, and died in Rome ; hence he was acquainted with the Church in a tolerably extensive circuit. The same was the case with Tatian, a native of Syria, who returned thither from Rome after Justin's death. Now Justin, in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, repeatedly appeals to original written testimonies, which he designates the memoirs or memorabilia of the apostles (*ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*). He views them both in their connection with and contrast to the writings of the prophets (*τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν*) ; that is, as a collection of writings, known and acknowledged by the Church, together with the Old Testament canon. As much that is found in the four Gospels is introduced in this dialogue, it is probable that

he included these among the memoirs he mentions.¹ He speaks, indeed, also of a Gospel, but this is quite in accordance with the feelings and expressions of the Church, and signifies the one objective Gospel, pervading all the subjective representations admitted by the Church. That Justin was acquainted with these also is evident, for he calls the memoirs *Gospels*.² When, then, the connection in which Justin and Tatian stand with each other is taken into account, we cannot but connect the memoirs appealed to by the former, with the Gospel writing composed by the latter. After the death of Justin, Tatian was led aside by the Gnostic tendencies then rife in his native place, and from which he probably had not before been entirely free. It was under this influence that he composed his work, the Diatessaron (*διὰ τεσσάρων*; out of four, or according to 'the four').³ As a Gnostic, he found many causes of offence in the Gospels handed down by the Church, which he intended to remedy in this composition, in which he omitted the genealogies of Christ and all passages relating to His descent from David. If Tatian, then, could thus designate his authorities, it is plain that in his days four Gospels must have been universally known and acknowledged; and how can it be supposed that these were any other than those known to his master Justin? Thus, in the middle of the second century, there were four Gospels, known as the four, decidedly looked upon as valid in the Church; and, according to Eusebius,⁴ these were the same four as those acknowledged in later times. Eusebius, however, was not acquainted with Tatian's work, and might therefore have been mistaken as to its reference to our four Gospels. But Theophilus of Antioch (A.D. 181) was also acquainted with four Gospels; and these must have been identical with ours, since Jerome was acquainted with commentaries on our four Gospels, which he attributed to Theophilus.⁵ In his work, *ad Autolycum*, B. iii., Theophilus speaks of the agreement between the prophets and Evangelists on the doctrine of justification; and this combination shows also the high degree of consideration which must have been awarded to the Evangelists in his days.

The testimony given to the Gospels by Papias, who was Bishop of Hierapolis about the middle of the second century, and is said to have suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius, offers many difficulties. Papias, as it at first appears, said (as reported by Eusebius

¹ [Eichhorn (represented in England by Bishop Marsh) denied this conclusion, but it has since been put beyond all question by Semisch and by Winer (Justin evan. canon. usum fuisse ostenditur, 1819). The argument is briefly but conclusively exhibited in W. Lindsay Alexander's *Christ and Christianity*, pp. 50-60 (1854). Above all, however, see the very thorough investigation by Westcott, *Gen. Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Test.*, pp. 105-199 (1855).—ED.]

² *Apolog.* ii. Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενουμένοις ὑπὲν αὐτῶν ἀπομημονεύμασιν, ἀκαλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, &c.

³ Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 29: ὁ Τατιανὸς συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθεῖς τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν.

⁴ See Note 3 above.

⁵ Comp. Kirchhofer, *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Canons bis auf Hieronymus*, p. 45.

in his *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 39) nothing concerning the Gospels of St Luke and St John. To this matter, however, we shall hereafter have to recur. Of St Matthew he says, that he wrote the λόγια (the oral Gospel) in the Hebrew language, which every one interpreted to the best of his ability; of St Mark, that he committed to writing what he learned (concerning the Gospel history) as interpreter to Peter. Both these accounts will have to be considered when we treat more particularly of these Evangelists. Thus much is, however, certain, that Papias was acquainted with one Gospel attributed to St Matthew, and another attributed to St Mark. But why does he not mention the Gospels of St Luke and St John? It almost seems as if the answer to this question might be gathered from a closer consideration of the report given of his expressions by Eusebius. According to this, Papias made a collection of the oral traditions concerning our Lord,¹ in five books (*συγγράμματα πέντε λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεως*). In the preface to this work, he explains the manner in which it was composed. He tells us that he did not concern himself with the communications of those who delivered new and strange precepts, but inquired after such as received what they delivered from the Lord Himself. ‘And if,’ continues he, ‘there came a disciple of the elders, I investigated the sayings of the elders: what Andrew or Peter had said, or what Philip, or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord’s disciples; *then also what Aristion or the presbyter John, the Lord’s disciples, say.*²’ Eusebius employs this passage in opposition to Irenaeus, who had said that Papias was a disciple (hearer) of John, and a companion of Polycarp. He remarks upon it, that Papias here twice introduces the name of John, the first time in connection with the apostles, the second in connection with Aristion, and designates this last John as the presbyter, thereby confirming the tradition of those who distinguished John the presbyter from the apostle of the same name, and maintained that the separate graves of both were still to be seen at Ephesus. But Eusebius overlooks the fact that Papias here also calls the apostles elders. It also escapes him, that Papias might here well introduce the name of John the apostle or presbyter twice, once as receiving his communications at the hands of his disciples, as he did those of Andrew or Peter, and again as receiving them directly, like those of Aristion. It is also necessary to remark, that John the presbyter is also decidedly distinguished from Aristion, both being called disciples of the Lord, but the title of presbyter being given to John alone. Was, then, Aristion, the disciple of the Lord, no presbyter according to the meaning attached to this word by the more modern church of Eusebius? In the days of Papias, the

¹ For the justification of this translation, see the section on the authenticity of St Matthew.

² Εἰ δὲ ποῦ καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τὸν Ἀνδρέας ἢ Πέτρος εἶπεν, ἢ τὸ Φίλιππος ἢ τὸ Θωμᾶς ἢ τὸ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τὸ Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἔτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν· ἀτε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν.

title presbyter, used in connection with an apostolic name, had still a special import in the Church. Papias first speaks of communications which he derived directly from the disciples of the Lord. He was then, in any case, in communication with such, whether their names were John, Aristion, or any other. He says, too, that he did not neglect *indirect* tradition, namely, such as he received from the disciples of the elders, *i.e.*, the apostles. When mentioning this second and minor source of information, he seems to feel the necessity of accrediting it by the words: As also Aristion and John the presbyter, the Lord's disciples, say. These, then, furnish him the ultimate corroboration of what he had learned indirectly concerning the apostles through their disciples; they must therefore certainly stand on the same level with those whom he names as his first and best authorities. Consequently John the presbyter could be no other than John the apostle; and the very words of Papias, in spite of their being misunderstood by Eusebius, confirm the statement of Irenæus. If, then, we may translate the Latin name Luke into the Greek Aristion, which seems very admissible (*Lucere, ἀριστεύω*), we have this satisfactory explanation of the fact, that the testimony of Papias to the two last Gospels is wanting, namely, that in the cases of the Evangelist Luke and the Apostle John, Papias had their own oral communications in support of his exegesis, in place of their Gospels; and this is the more probable, since he was in possession of oral traditions, and it was a principle with him to prefer them to written narratives.¹ In the case, then, of Luke and John he did not inquire after written Gospels, though he did so in that of Matthew and Mark; while, with respect to the Gospel of the latter, he inquired also into its apostolic foundation. He was, in fact, according to the words of Irenæus, an *ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ*, an ecclesiastical antiquarian. If such a man mentioned the two first Gospels with a few critical remarks, and passed by the two last without comment, such a fact is a strong corroboration of all.

To the testimony of Papias, we join that of Irenæus (A.D. 202). He tells us, in his work against heresies (iii. 1), that St Matthew brought out a Gospel among the Hebrews, in their own language, while St Peter and St Paul were preaching, and founding a church, at Rome: that after their departure, St Mark, the disciple and interpreter of St Peter, transmitted to us in writing what the latter had proclaimed: that St Luke, the companion of St Paul, gave a written summary of the Gospel preached by that apostle: and that St John also, the disciple of the Lord, who lay on His breast, composed a Gospel during his stay at Ephesus, in Asia.

Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 221), in his *Stromata* (B. iii.), quotes an expression which Christ is said to have used in answer to a question of Salome, remarking that this saying is not found in any of the four Gospels which have been handed down to us, but that it is contained in the Gospel of the Egyptians. He thus distinguishes

¹ Οὐ γάρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτον με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον_θσον τὰ παρὰ ἕωσης φῶνης καὶ μενούσης.

the latter from the four Gospels, which he views in the definite form of a concluded whole, possessing church authorization. According to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14), he expressed himself (in his *Hypotypeses*) concerning the Gospels in the following manner :—That those Gospels were first written which contain the genealogies : that St Mark, the companion of St Peter in Rome, had, at the request of many, set down what St Peter preached, and delivered it to them : that St Peter heard of this, but neither dissuaded him from the undertaking, nor urged him to it ; and that St John, last of all, seeing that in all these Gospels that which was corporeal had been communicated (*ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελοῖς δεδηλώται*), and being encouraged by his friends, and impelled by the Spirit, composed the spiritual Gospel (*πνευματικὸν ποιήσαι Εὐαγγέλιον*).

Tertullian, a contemporary of Clement (A.D. 220), also testifies to the authenticity of the four Gospels. In his work against Marcion, he accuses him of having mutilated the Gospel of St Luke (B. iv. c. 2). He lays down the principle, that the Gospels are, one and all, supported by the authority of the apostles, arguing that, though there were among the Evangelists disciples of the apostles, yet that these did not stand alone, but appeared with, as well as after the apostles. He thus views the apostolical testimony as a whole, in which those parts which are in themselves weaker, viz., the writings of St Mark and St Luke, partake of the strength of the unquestionable authority inherent in those of St Matthew and St John.¹

Such was the strength of ecclesiastical authentication bestowed upon our four Gospels, even at the beginning of the third and latter half of the second century. Their diffusion in the Church is also certain. Proofs of the early spread of the four Gospels in the Syrian church are afforded us by the fact, that they were known to Justin Martyr, to his disciple Tatian, and to Theophilus of Antioch. From the testimony of Papias, which is completed with respect to St Luke and St John by Irenæus, we obtain the voice of the Asiatic church, with which the Gallic was in communication. Clement (to whom may be added Origen, in his more frequent mention of the four Gospels), shows that, in his days, the Gospels were a special possession of the church of Alexandria, while Tertullian bears the same testimony with respect to that of North Africa.

The account given of the Gospels by Eusebius, in his *Ecclesiastical History* (iii. 24), may be regarded as the final result of the tradition of the early Church concerning them. He tells us that St Matthew, having preached the faith to the Hebrews, wrote his Gospel in his native tongue, when about to proceed to other nations ; and that St Mark and St Luke, having also given forth the Gospels known by their names, St John, who had hitherto confined himself

¹ Constituimus in primis evangelicum instrumentum apostolos auctores habere, quibus hoc munus evangeli promulgandi ab ipso domino sit impositum. Si et apostolicos, non tamen solos, sed cum apostolis et post apostolis. Quoniam praedicatio discipulorum suspecta fieri posset de glorio studio, si non adsistat illi auctoritas magistrorum, immo Christi, qui magistros apostolos fecit. Denique nobis fidem ex apostolis Joannes et Matthæus insinuant, ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant, &c.

to an unwritten announcement, resolved upon writing, for the purpose of corroborating and completing the three Gospels already in circulation ; and that he completed them, chiefly with respect to the commencement of Christ's preaching and ministry, which had been passed over by the others. Eusebius, in confirming the last view, as one already allowed, certainly lays too much stress upon an unimportant difference, but his testimony itself is independent of this explanation.

In the time, therefore, of Eusebius, *i.e.*, in the beginning of the fourth century, the authority of the four Gospels was regarded by the Church as unassailable, and they were reckoned among those books of the New Testament to which no objection existed. Their ecclesiastical authority could only be enhanced by their being designated as component parts of the canon by the decisions of general councils, an authorization which they subsequently received, especially at the Council of Laodicea, in the middle of the fourth century.

Subsequent ecclesiastical testimony need not here be entered into. It only remains to consider the manner in which the four Gospels were regarded and estimated by the Church, as collectively a spiritual whole. Even in his days Irenæus felt called upon to explain their relation according to its spiritual import.¹ ‘As there are four quarters of the heavens in the world wherein we dwell, and four winds, so are there four pillars of the Church which is spreading over the whole earth, viz., the four Gospels, into which the one pillar and support of the Church, the Gospel and the Spirit of life, divides itself, and, like four living spirits or winds, they diffuse on all sides immortal life, and reanimate mankind. The cherubim, whose appearance was fourfold, were their types. The first living creature was like a lion, denoting strength, dominion, and sovereignty. The Gospel of St John answers to this figure ; it represents the glorious and sovereign origin of Christ, the Word, by whom all things were made. The second was like an ox, denoting the ordinances of sacrifice and priesthood. Thus the Gospel of St Luke has a priestly character ; it commences with the priest Zacharias offering sacrifice to God. The third had the face of a man, plainly representing the human appearance of the Son of God. It is St Matthew who proclaims His human birth and its manner, after having begun with His genealogy. The fourth was like a flying eagle, denoting the gift of the Spirit hovering over the Church. Thus St Mark testifies of the prophetic spirit which comes from above, by referring to the prophet Isaiah.’ Though there is only a very superficial and external foundation for these allegories, yet ecclesiastical theologians continue to apply the cherubic forms to the Gospels.² Athanasius connected the human form with St Matthew, giving to St Mark the symbol of the ox, to St Luke that of the lion, to St John the eagle. Others endeavoured to introduce other combinations.³ The follow-

¹ *Advers. Haeres.*

² See Credner, *Einleitung in das Neue Test.* s. 55.

³ [These may be seen in Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v. εναγγελιστής. Trench has also devoted some interesting pages (p. 60) of his *Sacred Latin Poetry* (Lond. 1849) to this matter.—ED.]

ing, however, which is that of Jerome, prevailed :—‘ The first form, that of the man, denotes St Matthew, because he at once began to write of the man : ‘The book of the generation,’ &c. The form of the lion denotes St Mark, the voice of the roaring lion of the wilderness being heard in his Gospel. The third, that of the ox, signifies St Luke, who begins with the priest Zacharias. The fourth form, the eagle, represents St John, who soars above, as on eagles’ wings, and speaks of the Divine Word.’ This distribution of attributes is found also in paintings representing the four Evangelists. The second and fourth hits of these interpreters are evidently happier than they were themselves aware. The lion, especially the Asiatic lion, which is here intended, is a striking representation of the vigorous, bold, and graphic peculiarity of St Mark. The eagle well denotes the sublime spiritual flight of St John, and his bold gaze at the sun of the spiritual world. But how inappropriate is the application of the man to St Matthew, and of the ox to St Luke, if we look away from the mere incidents on which Jerome finds his comparison ! It is St Luke who pre-eminently exhibits the absolutely pure and divinely powerful humanity of Christ, and the human countenance might well characterize his Gospel ; while that of St Matthew, who more especially proclaimed to the Hebrew people the promised Messiah, in whose blood they were to find the real atonement, would be more appropriately symbolized by the sacrificial ox.

Modern exegesis may smile at such interpretations, as unprofitable trifling ; and truly they do exhibit, so to speak, the childhood of theology and exegesis. But one great perception of ancient ecclesiastical theology, viz., that each of the four Gospels has its characteristic significance, which is often entirely wanting in modern critical exegesis, cannot be misunderstood. The Church has still more correctly discerned and exhibited these peculiarities in the order in which the four Gospels are arranged, than in these interpretations ; for this order is in accordance with that in which the key-notes of the Christian life succeed each other, both in the apostolic band, and in the Church. St Matthew represents Old Testament Christianity, Jewish Christianity in its purity.¹ His Gospel everywhere points to the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New, and would perhaps in its very construction frequently reflect the ancient Scriptures. St Mark exhibits the Church in its Petrine spirit ; the contemplation of the Lord’s glorious work and terrible sufferings, of the stirring incidents of His life, is its chief concern. St Luke bears distinctly the impress of that emphasis with which Paul, and the Pauline spirit of the Church, proclaimed universalism, the grace which appeared unto all men, and which is peculiarly exemplified in the parable of the lost son. St John is the last peculiar spirit in

¹ If early pure, apostolic, Jewish Christianity has in our days been identified with the Ebionitism which gradually appeared in its midst, this fact exhibits not merely a gross misconception of the spiritual glory of primitive Christianity, but also a great want of historical accuracy, which, even in view of the subsequently degenerate and mutilated state of Jewish Christianity, still distinguished between Nazarenes and Ebionites.

the Gospel series, and denotes that deepest and inmost disposition of the apostolic Church, which, because it was the deepest, was the last manifested in its historic development: he is the representative of that spirit which finds its happiness in the contemplation of God in Christ.

NOTES.

1. Church tradition with respect to the four Gospels has been neglected, and even contemned, in the transactions of modern criticism, in a manner which would never have been suffered in the sphere of profane literature. [See Isaac Taylor's *Transmission of Ancient Books to Modern Times*.—ED.]

2. The well-known and ingenious view of Schelling, according to which the Apostles Peter, Paul, and John exhibit types of three successively developed forms of the universal Church, is supported by the order of the four Evangelists. But the type of the early Church would, according to this order, be severed in two. The patriarchal or orthodox Church would be the first type, represented by Matthew, who connects the Old with the New Testament, as that Church did the ancient ways of the world with the new life of Christianity. The Catholic Church would be the second; its representative is St Mark. The common key-note of both is certainly expressed by the peculiarity of St Peter. In these typical views, indeed, only that which is truly Christian in each form of the Church is contemplated.

SECTION II.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE FIRST GOSPEL.

The Gospel, entitled the Gospel according to St Matthew, was unanimously attributed by the early Church to the apostle of that name, who, before his call to the apostleship, was a publican living on the shores of the Lake of Galilee (Matt. ix. 9). The most ancient testimony is that of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, who, according to the before-cited account of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39), declared, when speaking of this Gospel, that Matthew first wrote it in the Hebrew language, and that every one translated or explained it to the best of his power.¹ From a mistaken view of this evidence, a doubt of the genuineness of this Gospel first arose, and it is from its true sense that a due estimation of this book must proceed. Pantænus, the founder of the Alexandrian catechetical school, found, during a missionary journey, a Hebrew Gospel of St Matthew among the Christians of Southern Arabia (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 10). Irenæus also informs us (*advers. Hæres.* iii. 1) that Matthew brought out a Gospel among the Hebrews, in their own language. Origen (according to Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 25),

¹ Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραιῶν διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἡμηρευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἡδύνατο ἔκαστος (Var. i. ὡς ἦν δύνατος ἔκαστος).

Eusebius (iii. 24), Epiphanius (*Hæres.* 30, 3), Chrysostom (*Hom. in Matt. i.*), Jerome (*Catal. de vir. ill. c. 3*), and others, also assert the same fact.

This tradition is corroborated by the relation in which the Greek Gospel of St Matthew stands both to the Hebrew language and to the Old Testament text. With regard to the first relation, this Gospel is interspersed with Hebrew words and constructions. The quotations from the Old Testament are generally not taken from the Septuagint, the current Greek translation, but are fresh translations of the Hebrew text.¹ Errors of translation, said to be found in the Greek text, seem, however, to have been somewhat arbitrarily discovered.²

Schleiermacher, in his essay on the testimony of Papias (*Theol. Studien und Kritiken, Jahrg. 1832*), tries to prove that Papias only knew of a collection of sayings from St Matthew, because the expression *τὰ λογία* could only mean sayings or discourses, and could not also be applied to acts. Lücke, on the other hand, shows that the words *τὰ λογία* are certainly used to designate a Gospel, comprising not only the sayings of the Lord, but also His deeds; adducing the fact, that Papias uses the same expression when speaking of the Gospel of St Mark, and employs the words *τὰ λογία* in the same sense as the expression: what Christ both said and did (*τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἦ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα*). It may also be remarked, that it would be a bold step for any grammarian so to limit the meaning of the expression *τὰ λογία*, as to cast upon the whole of the Greek Church (which certainly believed *τὰ λογία* and the present entire Gospel of Matthew to be identical) the reproach of being ignorant of the Greek language. It must also be taken into account, that Papias does not here define *τὰ λόγια* as *τὰ λόγια* of the Lord. He seems rather to use the word as a current one, and therefore in an absolute sense. How very probable, then, is the supposition that, in his train of thought, this word might signify the oral communications of the Gospel history then current, in contrast to the written narratives. He tells us that he carefully investigated the words of the presbyters (*τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λόγους*). In

¹ See Credner, *Einleit. in das Neue Testament*, p. 75. [A very ingenious application of these quotations is made by Westcott, *Introd.* p. 208. He says that they are of two kinds, those quoted by Matthew himself, and those woven in with the discourses of our Lord; and that the former are always original renderings of the Hebrew, the latter, in the main, agreeing with the LXX. This he thinks helps out his theory, that the Greek Gospel was not so much a translation as a substitute for the Hebrew, both having been current from the first as oral Gospels. The same distinction had been already made by Bleek, and is discussed by Ebrard, p. 524. Of the additions made by the translator, Davidson speaks, p. 47, vol. i.—ED.]

² When, e.g., it is asserted that Christ did not say, according to Matt. viii. 22, ‘Let the dead bury their dead,’ but, let other (men) bury their dead; viz., not *מִתְיָהֶם*, *מִתְיָהֶם מִתְיָהֶם מִתְיָהֶם*, but *מִתְיָהֶם מִתְיָהֶם*. [So good a judge as Wetstein has so little idea of errors in translation that he says, ‘Nullum certe in nostro Matthæo reperitur indicium, unde colligi possit, ex alia in aliam linguam fuisse conversum; plurima vero aliud suadent.’ Reuss (*Geschichte der Heil. Schriften*, p. 183) is of the same opinion.—ED.]

this case the word in dispute would designate the Gospel history then still current in oral discourse ($\tauῶν λογιῶν$).¹ The argument of Schleiermacher is, at all events, untenable. In bringing it forward, it seems also to have been lost sight of, that by the composition of so partial a Gospel, a Gospel of sayings only, St Matthew would but ill have corresponded with the vigour and concrete copiousness required in an Evangelist and apostle. One of our modern abstract evangelists indeed, by whom miracles might be regarded as the suspicious matter from which he was to separate as far as possible the spirit of the words, in order to attain to the genuine or supposed sublimity of the Gospel, would, under the influence of such spiritualizing notions, according to which the Gospel fact, *the Word was made flesh*, has not yet been entirely fulfilled, have been more likely to hit upon the expedient of communicating the sayings of the Lord not merely separately, but exclusively. The whole argument, however, is overthrown by the fact, hereafter to be proved, that a deep and comprehensive unity is the foundation on which St Matthew's Gospel rests. This unity is a pledge that in the Greek Gospel of St Matthew we possess, on the whole, a transcript, though a free translation of the Hebrew. Since, however, tradition declares the original Gospel of this Evangelist to have been a Hebrew one, we must, with the certainty that a translation was made, concede the possibility of trifling emendations having been made also. Even Papias was acquainted with several versions, which did not all seem to satisfy him equally. It may, however, be supposed, that the better translations, and those most faithful to the original, were most in use in the Church, till that which was the best prevailed over the rest.

Sieffert and Schneckenburger have felt it incumbent upon them to attack the genuineness of St Matthew's Gospel, on internal grounds.² First, the author is said to have been entirely ignorant of many things, which an apostle must have known. This conclusion is drawn from the incompleteness of his communications. But a like incompleteness might be charged upon each of the Evangelists successively, if they had bound themselves to afford a complete and verbally accurate representation of our Lord's life. This is, however, an utterly erroneous assumption. The second argument also, that the Evangelist has not reported successive events in their chronological order, arises from an erroneous assumption. For it is evident from the whole construction of this Gospel, that the Evangelist prefers such an arrangement of events as must naturally often break through the chronological order, and displace many occurrences. Hence

¹ [The readiest proof of the meaning of *λογία* is the title of Papias' own work, *κυριακῶν λογίων ἐξήγησις*, a work occupied with events as well as with sayings. For further proof, see Davidson's *Introd.* i. 66; or Ebrard's *Gospel History*, p. 527, note. One thing, however, is to be observed, that if Papias referred to Matthew's Gospel, then the Greek translation was unknown in his time, or at least to him.—Ed.]

² See my essay on the authenticity of the four Gospels in the *Theol. Stud. und Kritik.* 1839, No. 1; Sieffert, *Ueber den Ursprung des erst. canon. Evang.* Königsberg 1832; Schueckenburger, *Ueber den Ursprung d. erst. canon. Evang.* Stuttgart 1834.

there may arise inaccuracies in the order of the narrative, but not in the matter of the events themselves. Thirdly, it is said that separate occurrences are combined in this Gospel, in a manner which is the fruit of tradition. The examples enumerated, however, would seem rather to prove the contrary; as, for instance, the supposed origination of a twofold miraculous feeding of the multitude, from a single event. In this case, however, it is taken for granted, instead of proved, that this miracle was but once performed. Besides, could inaccuracies occur in the description of an event at which the apostle, as such, must have been present? The mention of the foal which, according to Matthew, ran beside the ass, at Christ's entrance into Jerusalem, is said to have arisen from a misunderstanding of Zech. ix. 9. It is certainly possible that the translator might, in such particulars, have made additions which he thought improvements. Thus even a critical examination seems gradually to lead to this view,¹ and consequently to corroborate the testimony of Papias in the natural and correct meaning attributed to it before the explanation of Schleiermacher.

NOTES.

1. Ammon, in his *Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, vol. i. p. 53, &c., endeavours to identify the Gospel of St Matthew with the Gospel of the Hebrews, often named by the fathers. He says that the Hebrew Christians must have needed a short history of the life of Jesus, in their own language; and that according to credible testimony, they were provided with one. ‘It bore the name of the Gospel of the Hebrews or Nazarenes, and was attributed to the twelve apostles, but especially to St Matthew.’ A frequently corrected Greek translation, he says further on, banished the Aramaean original. ‘This Hellenistic translation of the original Aramaean Gospel is included by Justin Martyr among his memoirs of the apostles, because it coincided with the early oral tradition of Palestine, and was first attributed exclusively to St Matthew, when the appearance of other Gospels, representing respectively the views of St Peter, St Paul, and St John, no longer suffered the names of the twelve apostles to be given to it.’ Upon this hypothesis, it is inexplicable why the fathers who quote this Gospel of the Hebrews, e.g., Origen and Jerome, should so emphatically distinguish it from the Gospel of Matthew. It might also fairly be asked, why a Gospel of the twelve apostles, composed in a Jewish-Christian spirit, should, when it was afterwards found desirable to designate its author, have received the name of St Matthew rather than that of St James. Besides, the title *secundum Hebreos*, seems from the first to denote an apocryphal production. Hence the hypothesis is in every respect untenable.²

¹ Compare Kern: *Ueber den Ursprung des Evangeliums Matthai*; *Tübinger Zeitschrift*; 1834, No. 2.

² [The quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews collected in Append. D. of Westcott's *Introd.* prove that it was not identical with Matthew's Gospel; at the same time, they seem almost as distinctly to prove that the two were intimately

2. Sieffert, in his above-mentioned essay, endeavours to prove the view frequently expressed by others, that St Matthew, whose name is included in the apostolic catalogue, and whose call is related (Matt. ix. 9), is not identical with Levi, whose conversion is described in Mark (chap. ii. 13) and Luke (chap. v. 27). Levi is said to have received a more general call, and not such a one as brought him within the apostolic band. This view is, however, very improbable. If Levi were formally called from the receipt of custom to follow Christ, as related by St Mark and St Luke—and if the same occurrence took place with respect to St Matthew, according to his own Gospel, and we afterwards find the name of St Matthew in the list of the apostles, but not that of Levi,—it is most probable that Matthew was known by the name of Levi to the two Evangelists, who both relate the history of a conversion coinciding with his.

SECTION III.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE SECOND GOSPEL.

Mark John, or John Mark, a disciple of the apostles, who accompanied the Apostles Paul and Barnabas, and afterwards Barnabas alone, on missionary journeys, who was subsequently the companion of Peter (1 Pet. v. 13), and is said to have suffered martyrdom at Alexandria, is very decidedly declared by the primitive Church to have been the author of this Gospel.

Papias, who refers the Greek Gospel of St Matthew to a Hebrew original, also refers the Gospel of St Mark to the oral preaching of St Peter. He relates that, according to the communications of the presbyter John, St Mark, as the interpreter to St Peter, committed to writing what that apostle delivered, not however in the order in which perhaps Christ spoke or acted, but in that in which St Peter arranged his deeds and sayings, according to the needs of his audience. Schleiermacher thinks that this information shows that Papias was not speaking of our Gospel according to St Mark, which always preserves a chronological arrangement. But neither John the presbyter nor Papias affirm that no chronological arrangement existed, but that this was not one of strict historical correctness. St Peter combined the sayings and deeds of the Lord according to his own views and the exigencies of preaching, and in this combination a certain sequence was formed; this forms the basis of St Mark's Gospel, which thus gains in apostolical what it loses in chronological authority. If John the presbyter had in view the order of St John's Gospel, he might well declare of this collection of life-like pictures from the life of Jesus, related. This relation is determined by Ebrard, p. 527, but most ably and satisfactorily by Davidson, vol. i. pp. 12-36. And it may be added, that if the Aramaic original of Matthew existed in the latter half of the second century, only in the form of heretical, or at best, suspected recensions, then there is no difficulty in seeing how the Greek Gospel should have become the canonical, while the original was only ranked among the Antilegomena.—ED.]

undivided into years, and omitting all notice of His ministry in Judea, that the original order ($\tauάξις$) had not been observed.

Irenæus gives a similar account of the origin of this Gospel (*adv. Haeres.* iii. 1). After the death of St Peter and St Paul at Rome, St Mark, the disciple and interpreter of St Peter, committed to writing what the latter had preached. Clement of Alexandria, however, says that even during St Peter's ministry in Rome, St Mark, at the request of many, took down much of what he delivered, and that St Peter, when he heard this, neither specially assisted nor prevented him (Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* vi. 14). Tertullian and Origen agree, in the main, with this account. According to the report of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 15), St Peter is said to have authenticated this Gospel, and commended it to the Church under the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

The universal recognition of the authenticity of this Gospel has not been extended to its conclusion (chap. xvi. 9–20), which, on both internal and external grounds, has been regarded as the addition of a later hand. That Eusebius did not include this paragraph, is shown by his remark, that the passage in which the departure of the women from the grave is related, formed the conclusion in almost all copies. Jerome, Gregory of Nyssa, Euthymius Zigabenus, and others, express themselves in a similar manner.¹ The characteristic style of Mark is also wanting in this conclusion, his animated expressions, his repetitions, his use of uncommon and often of Latin words; while peculiarities are found which do not belong to this Evangelist. It is, however, overstepping the bounds of caution to reckon every creature ($\piάσα κτίσις$), to speak with new tongues ($γλώσσαις καναΐς λαλεῖν$), and similar expressions, among them. If less regard were paid to such isolated expressions, many of which, in the record of a life so variously developed, might well make their first or only appearance in single passages, and more bestowed upon the general manner in which occurrences are viewed, and upon the change of scene in this paragraph, a different conclusion might perhaps be arrived at, with regard to internal evidence. The fulness and boldness of the promise, in respect of the evidence of the senses, with which Christ sends forth His disciples into the world, the strong expression *every creature*, and similar ones, seem quite in accordance with the style of this Evangelist.² It is also worthy of consideration that Irenæus, who lived a century before Eusebius expressed himself as above mentioned, quotes the present conclusion of this Gospel (*adv. Haeres.* iii. 10, 6). The circumstance that, in the earliest times, some copies had this addition, and some not, may be explained by the supposition, that an incomplete work

¹ See Credner, 106.

² [Yet it is difficult thus to account for twenty new expressions in half the number of verses. These are very fairly stated by Davidson, p. 169. Alford, whose judgment is here, as always, most worthy of consideration, thinks the internal evidence 'very weighty against Mark's being the author.' Ebrard adopts the not untenable hypothesis advocated by the author. If a considerable time elapsed between the two publications, this would sufficiently account for the change of style.—ED.]

of Mark came into the hands of the Christian public before the subsequently complete one. In such a work of quick execution and production, of sudden delay, and hesitation at a fresh chief incident, and of subsequent completion, the characteristics of Mark, as shown in many instances, are accurately reflected.

SECTION IV.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

St Luke, the companion of St Paul on several of his missionary journeys, and the author of the Acts of the Apostles, is also known to us as the writer of the third Gospel. He himself, in the opening of the Acts of the Apostles, refers to a Gospel of which he was the writer.

It must be inferred that Tatian was acquainted with the Gospel of St Luke, since he would hardly have sought to base his Diatessaron, or Gospel-harmony depending upon four Gospels, in the very face of the Church, upon an apocryphal production. We know, from the work of Tertullian against Marcion, that the latter was acquainted with this Gospel, which Tertullian reproaches him with having corrupted, because he found its more universal character, and its adaptation to Gentile Christians, make it more suitable to his system than those of the other Evangelists.¹ Irenæus reckons St Luke among the four Evangelists; remarking, that as the companion of St Paul, he committed to writing the Gospel preached by that apostle.² Origen and Eusebius also designate him as the author of the Gospel which tradition ascribes to him. According to Eusebius, it was a current opinion, that St Paul, when using the expression, according to my Gospel, intended thereby the Gospel according to St Luke. Jerome (*Comment. in Isaiam*, 6, 9) remarks, that the Greek education which Luke had received as a physician is apparent in his Gospel. The genuineness of this Gospel has been least opposed by critics, a circumstance owing, perhaps, to the fact, that the authority of this Evangelist is more easily attacked from a different quarter. St Luke, as a Hellenist and a disciple of St Paul, had not access to the chief mass of evangelical tradition as the other Evangelists. It was therefore more difficult for him, than for them, to obtain the Gospel treasure in its purity. But, on the other hand, he had, in the direction given to his mind by the teaching of St Paul, a more developed feeling for certain aspects and incidents of the Gospel history. In any case, he was so grafted into the genuine stock of primitive tradition by St Paul, who lived in frequent intercourse with the Church at Jerusalem, that the genuineness and purity of his narration cannot be disputed.

NOTE.

The question why St Luke is not named by Papias, might perhaps find an answer in our previous remarks on his testimony. In

¹ Tertull. *adv. Marcionem*, iv. 5.

² *Adv. Haeres.* iii. 14, 1.

favour of the supposition, that by Aristion, the Lord's disciple, spoken of by Papias, we are to understand the Evangelist Luke, it may be remarked : (1.) That he connects Aristion with John the presbyter, whom he calls, as well as the former, the Lord's disciple ; (2.) that he considers both as representatives of the oral tradition which he received from the immediate witnesses of the life of Jesus ; (3.) that they appear, as such, to stand in a kind of contrast to St Matthew and St Mark, to whose written Gospels Papias appeals. According to the information of Isidore of Hispalis (*de ortu, &c.*, c. 82), St Luke died in his seventy-fourth year ; according to a notice in the work of Jerome (*Catal. de vir. ill.* c. 7), supposed to be an interpolation (see Credner, *Einleit.* &c., 129), he lived till the age of eighty-four. If it were in his youth that he accompanied the Apostle Paul, he might, if he attained an advanced age, as well as the Apostle John, have been known in his old age by Papias, who, in that case, would, in conformity with his maxim, have concerned himself with his oral communications, and not with his writings. This view, too, refers to the information of Epiphanius, that Luke was one of the seventy, and to the remark of Theophylact (*Proem. in Lucam*), that he was, according to the assertion of some, the unnamed disciple of the journey to Emmaus.

SECTION V.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The testimony which forms the appendix of this Gospel (John xxi. 24, 25), declares that John was the disciple who testified and wrote what precedes it. We know that his testimony is true, say the witnesses. The genuineness, then, of this Gospel seems to be here vouched for by Christian contemporaries. In our times the worth of such testimony has been, at one time, represented as quite decisive, at another, as utterly devoid of value.¹ A testimony accompanied by no signature, and forming an integral part of the matter testified, does indeed stand in a peculiar position. Such a testimony can have no direct value in our eyes ; its force lies in the indirect value it obtains for us by the recognition of the early Church. The communities of Christians, among whom the first copies of this Gospel were diffused, were delivered from all doubts respecting its genuineness by this decisive assurance at its close. Doubt was, so to speak, challenged to make objections ; and all possibility that this Gospel was for some time used without respect to its author, and a spurious tradition concerning its origin, gradually formed, was thus obviated. This testimony, too, acquires fresh weight in our eyes, through the Gospel with which it is connected. For, if it had not originated at the same place and time it would scarcely be

¹ Compare Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte*, p. 276 ; Weisse, *Die evang. Gesch.* vol. i. 99.

found in all copies, but would have been wanting in some, like the conclusion of Mark's Gospel.

It can be easily explained why this Gospel at first should be more extolled by the Gnostics than by the orthodox Church itself. This Church, for the most part, had not yet attained the power of entering into the spiritual views of St John. It cherished and valued the treasure, but it was some time before it grew up to the full understanding and application of it. The Churches specially edified by reading the Shepherd of Hermas, could hardly maintain a Pauline point of view, much less attain to that of St John; and even when Hellenistically educated theologians began to use this Gospel, it hardly became popular,—indeed it can scarcely be said to be so now. But the Gnostics had, from the first, a speculative tendency; and the eternal relation of God to the world, explained by this Evangelist in his doctrine of the Logos, was the leading question of their whole system. If John did not answer this question exactly as they did, this was only another reason why they would take possession of this Gospel, perhaps in the same manner as Marcion made unlawful use of the Gospel of Luke. Thus also did the Valentinians, according to the testimony of Irenæus (*adv. Hæres.* iii. 11, 7), lay violent hands on this Gospel. Heracleon wrote a commentary on it; and even the Montanists made use of it, not, indeed, merely on account of the promise of the Paraclete, which they referred to Montanus, but because this Gospel corresponded with the really sound fundamental principles of their tendencies. On the other hand, the fact that the Alogi attributed this Gospel to Cerinthus, proves how lightly they formed this opinion, since the well-known views of Cerinthus could by no means be reconciled with those of a work setting forth the incarnate and crucified Son of God. It must be inferred that it formed one of the supports of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, especially as he quotes it in his *λόγος πρὸς Ἑλληνας*, cap. xiii.

Though Justin Martyr does not mention this Evangelist by name, we find in his writings so many echoes of the style of John, and such decided prominence given to the doctrine of the Logos especially, that his intimate acquaintance with this Gospel cannot but be assumed. His whole stand-point, which can only be explained by the existence of the Johannean basis, gives silent but important testimony to its apostolic character. Christians in those days, indeed, equally relied upon the Shepherd of Hermas; but the brilliant popularity of this work never obtained for it a recognition as canonical, because the spirit of Christian criticism prevailed in the Church. It was this spirit which caused Justin's doctrine of the Logos to be esteemed apostolical.¹

Theophilus of Antioch is the first Christian author who, in quoting from this Gospel, names St John as its author (*ad. Autol.* ii. 22). Irenæus (*adv. Hæres.* iii. 1) makes John conclude the series of Evangelists which he mentions. He says that John, the disciple

¹ [For the reasons why Papias does not mention this Gospel see above, p. 127.—ED.]

of the Lord, who lay on His bosom, himself produced this Gospel, while living at Ephesus. Himself, *i.e.*, in contrast to Peter and Paul, who caused their assistants, Mark and Luke, to write Gospels. He is followed by a series of fathers, who name John as the author of this Gospel, as Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius.

The Gospel of St John, though less intimately known by the majority than the other Gospels, has nevertheless been regarded by the Church as the sublimest and most spiritual of all. The heart of Christ has been felt to vibrate in it, and the conviction that it was the work of John, the disciple who lay on the Lord's bosom, has been a certain one. Hence the internal reasons for its genuineness were regarded by the early Church as unquestionable. The fact, then, that a series of critics should, in our days, have come to the conviction, that the internal nature of this Gospel itself gives rise to doubts of its genuineness, must be received as denoting an utter revolution of spiritual feeling. Bretschneider, indeed, suppressed his attack upon the authenticity of this Gospel, founded on arguments of this kind, in consequence of the effect produced by the replies.¹ Strauss followed it up with doubts, now of a slighter, now of a stronger kind. He was succeeded by Weisse, Bruno Bauer, and others; and thus was formed a series, in which each 'went beyond' his predecessors, in disputing the authenticity of St John's Gospel.

Strauss frequently expresses in his work his doubts of the authenticity of this Gospel, discrediting the genuineness of the discourses of Jesus therein recorded, when tried by the laws of probability, and of the retentiveness of the memory.² On the strange uniformity of the discourses of Jesus, he prefers allowing others, whom he cites, to express themselves, while he himself brings forward more prominently the uniformity found in the replies of the Lord's Jewish opponents. 'The misunderstandings are not infrequently so gross as to surpass belief, and always so uniform as to resemble a standing manner.' Certainly it cannot be denied that the whole picture bears a strong impress of the style of John, who neither furnished, nor meant to furnish, a mere protocol. With respect to the constant recurrence of the misunderstandings, it may be observed, that it was one chief endeavour of this Evangelist to confirm by characteristic facts that general statement which he placed at the commencement of his Gospel: 'The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.' If the critic should find it strange that there should, in this respect, be 'no difference between a Samaritan woman and one of the most educated of the Pharisees,' we might refer to the universal character of this standing manner, prevailing, as it does, quite as much in our own days as formerly, and in which there is no difference between a Samaritan woman and a man of the most liberal education.³ Strauss himself

¹ [Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Iohannis Apost. indole ac origine, Lips. 1820.—ED.]

² [Leben Jesu, part i. p. 730.—ED.]

³ Heb. xii. 3; 1 Cor. i. 21.

here freely confesses that in many other cases, both the objections of hearers and the replies of Jesus are perfectly consistent. With respect to the law of the retentiveness of the memory, it is remarked, that discourses brought forth as these are, in connected demonstrations and continuous dialogues, are just of the kind most difficult to retain in the memory and faithfully to report. Here, then, we cannot expect a strict line of demarcation between what forms part of the Evangelist's own mind and what is alien to it, nor an objectivity, properly so called. Such an expectation would involve an utterly false and unchristological assumption, obscuring the relation of an Evangelist to the Lord's objectivity. Certainly the assumption is of more ancient date, being, in fact, that supernaturalistic view, according to which an Evangelist is but the literal reporter of the words and deeds of Christ, unalterably impressed upon his own mind. But for such an office, so choice and sanctified an individuality as, e.g., that of St John, would have been unnecessary. The distinctness of his remembrance does not consist in the scholastic retentiveness of his head; his evangelical memory is identical with his inner life, his spiritual views, and especially with his evangelical love and joy. *A line of demarcation* between his own life and that which was 'alien,' or, correctly speaking, most germane to it, would have been here quite out of place. But, it may be asked, is not the objective significance, the Christianity of his communications, rendered insecure by such a blending of his own life with the Gospel history? This would indeed be the case if we were obliged to own that John was unfaithful to his apostolic office; and had in any respect so brought forward the productions of his own mind as to give himself the greater prominence, and attract to himself the attention due to his Master. That this, however, is a view which cannot be entertained, has before been proved. There were, indeed, features in John's character in which he surpassed Peter, and all the other disciples, as also features in which he was surpassed by them; but that he should, in any particular, surpass Christ, contradicts the significance both of the Master and of the disciple; or that he, like Judas, for instance, withdrew one single element of the glory appertaining to Christ's power, entirely contradicts his apostolic character.

Hence the colouring which the objective Gospel of the Lord obtains from St John's mind can consist only in the form given by it to the composition and illustration of the evangelical material with which it was penetrated. Through him the infinite richness of the life of Jesus displays new depths, presents a new aspect, and produces a new influence upon the world. It is incorrect to say that the sayings and parables of Jesus recorded by the other Evangelists were merely such as were more easy of retention. That which is most germane, most impressive to the individual mind, is at the same time most easily retained thereby. One mind will most readily remember numbers, another verses, a third philosophical formulæ; and it would be quite too idyllic a psychology to

assert that the disciples, on the other hand, must have had a memory only for parables. Whence comes it, then, that the disciples of a philosopher know so well how to retain and use his formulæ? Can it be said, in an abstract manner, that these are retainable in this or that degree, and therefore this or that man retained them? Or may not the matter be better explained by attributing it to philosophical elective affinities? It would then be the christological elective affinity which caused John to 'retain' from the copious materials of the Gospel history that which was most retainable, nay, most incapable of being forgotten by himself.

When Strauss further finds it inexplicable that John should not have recorded the agony in Gethsemane, this is the result of his assumption, that this Gospel is a mere collection of memorabilia without any fixed plan. The assumption is, however, a false one. John had a definite idea to guide him in its composition, and it was his plan which led him to pass by this great conflict. His intention was to exhibit the glory of the suffering Redeemer in the presence of His enemies, in the whole series of those various incidents in which it was displayed. Among the demonstrations of this glory, however, His agony is not entirely omitted; its result, namely, that serenity of mind with which the Lord afterwards confronted His enemies, and which He won in this struggle, being prominently brought forward. But this critic seems still more surprised, that John should, in the farewell discourse (chap. xiv.-xvii.), present the Lord to us as one who had in spirit already overcome the suffering which was still before Him; while, according to the synoptists, this tranquillity seems afterwards to have been exchanged for the most violent agitation, this serenity for the fear of death. 'In the so-called high-priestly prayer (John xvii.), Jesus had completely settled His account with the Father; all hesitation, with respect to what lay before Him, was so far past, that He did not waste a word upon His own sufferings. If, then, Jesus, after this settlement, again opened an account with God, if, after thinking Himself the victor, He was again involved in fearful conflict, must it not be asked: Why, instead of revelling in vain hopes, didst Thou not rather employ Thyself with serious thoughts of Thine approaching sufferings, &c.? ' Perhaps the critic might have found in the lives of Savonarola, Luther, and others of God's heroes, analogies which might have led to a solution of this enigma. There is a great difference between complete victory over anxiety of mind, and complete victory over the natural feelings. In Christ's conflict, there is not a shadow of irresolution or uncertainty; the same mind which in one Gospel utters the high-priestly intercession, in the others offers the high-priestly sacrifice, in the words: 'Not my will but Thine be done.' But He brings it as a fresh sacrifice, streaming with the blood of unutterable sorrow. Did not Christ express this sorrow to His Father in that most pregnant saying: If it be possible, let this cup pass from Me! A further difficulty is also

discovered in the fact, that John had previously described a conflict analogous to that in Gethsemane, viz., in the scene where certain Greeks, who had come to the feast, desired to see the Lord, and His soul is described as being deeply moved on this very occasion. Strauss is of opinion that the two synoptical 'anecdotes' of the agony in the garden and the transfiguration are blended in this one circumstance; and thinks John's representation strange, because Jesus is 'in the open day, and amidst thronging multitudes, thus agitated, while he finds that of the synopists, who represent this as occurring in the solitude of a garden, and in the dead of night, more comprehensible. It is, however, in the nature of a presentiment to be aroused by contrast. The dark forebodings of Cassandra are excited by the festivities and hymns of rejoicing in the palaces of Troy; and it is at the coronation, which she was the instrument of bringing about, that Joan of Arc is struck with this tragic sentiment. These fictions are entirely in accordance with the psychology of heroic tragedy, if not with the psychology of everyday convenience. Thus also Christ weeps over Jerusalem amidst the hosannas of the applauding multitude. The feeling of security at mid-day, and of agitation during the darkness of the night, may be in keeping with the idyll, or with the domestic drama, but is out of place here. In one of Oehlenschlager's plays a candid cobbler declares, that at mid-day he is often so bold that he is actually obliged to put some constraint upon himself to believe in God; but at night, in the dark forest, when the owls are hooting and the old oaks creaking, he could believe in anything that was required, in God or in the devil. Are we then to listen to the critic, and apply, in this instance, the standard of this magnanimous cobbler? Beside, the whole rhythm of this anxious presentiment is misconceived in the foregoing argument. Why should it not recur with augmented force? Is not such a recurrence quite in keeping with the higher and more refined regions of the world of mind? The shudder of terror, as well as other deep mental emotions, is rhythmical. Instead, then, of finding in the twofold recurrence of this foreboding, a mark of uncertainty in the narrative of St John, the traces of this emotion in the Gospels should be carefully followed up, to see whether it may not still more frequently recur, as, e.g., in the discourse with Nicodemus. Bretschneider asks, with reference to His high-priestly prayer, whether it is conceivable that Jesus, in the expectation of a violent death, could find nothing more important to do, than to converse with God concerning His person, His doings hitherto, and the glory He was expecting? In such a view, says Strauss, we arrive at the more correct notion, that the prayer in question appears to be not a direct outpouring, but rather a retrospective production; not so much a discourse of Jesus, as a discourse about Him. It might be asked of Bretschneider, what then could Christ find to do more important? Bequeath a library perhaps, or set papers in order, or make His escape to Alexandria or Damascus? There is nothing here to help the cautious critic, to whom making a testament and

making a New Testament is an immense contradiction. The mountain does not come to the prophet.

Willst den Dichter du verstehen,
Musst in Dichters Lande gehen,

is applicable to the prayer of the true High Priest and its reviewers. Strauss finds in it not a direct outpouring, but a retrospect. Is it to be wondered at, that feeling, in its perfection, should be vented entirely in thoughts? Or should the words have been intermingled with the Ohs! and Ahs! of an enthusiast, lest they should seem only a retrospect? Such reasoning is called forth by the old assumption of an irreconcilable antagonism between ‘head and heart;’ but attention must be called to the infinitely acute understanding, the perfect reflection exhibited in the structure of a blossoming rose, the beautiful type of a mind glowing with love.

The leading idea of Weisse’s argument against the genuineness of this Gospel, has been already cited and refuted. The supposed duplexity of the Christ of the synoptical Gospels and the Christ of St John is an illusion. The ancient Church, in its intimate acquaintance with the subject, never perceived that double of the actual Christ, the John-like Christ, or Christ-like John of Professor Weisse. The view in question is connected with a multitude of erroneous assumptions. When it is said, for instance, that ‘in the portraiture of Christ, as given in the synoptical Gospels, the mind of the Evangelist is a medium of transmission wholly indifferent, while in that of John it is a co-operative power in the production,’ this assertion is entirely refuted by the fact, that each of the three first Gospels displays its own distinct peculiarity. Besides, according to this opinion, the synoptical portraiture of Christ would be a mere dull copy, that of John an artistic picture; and it might well be asked which was preferable. But in any case, the representation of John would still be a *portrait* of Christ. Weisse, however, subsequently withdraws such an assumption. ‘John gives us less a *portrait* than a *notion* of Christ; his Christ does not speak *from*, but *about* His person.’ But could He then not speak *from* His person *about His own* person? Is the Christ who converses at Jacob’s well with the woman of Samaria, and weeps at the grave of Lazarus, a mere notion—is this less a *portrait* than the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount? Weisse also proceeds upon the view that the Gospel of St John was composed independently of any settled plan. ‘In fact, it appears from the uniform character of the discourses, not to mention the selection of the events narrated, so entirely devoid of plan, that no other explanation offers itself to the unprejudiced reader than the accident that these, and no other occurrences, came to the author’s knowledge; or, on the other hand, the equally accidental possibility of a connection of these, and no other narratives, with the matter in the possession of the author for the carrying out of his work,’ that is, with the discourses recorded by the Apostle John. The want of plan in this Gospel is only

the assertion of the critic, which may, with equal or greater justice, be met by a counter assertion. It will be our task to affirm its entire conformity to a settled plan when we subsequently treat of this Gospel. A hint at its fundamental idea must suffice for the present. Throughout the whole composition, the Evangelist is carrying out the theme: ‘The light shined in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not;’ or, as it is stated with greater detail, ‘He came unto His own, and His own received Him not; but to as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God’ (chap. i. 5–11). This was the fundamental thought upon which this Evangelist composed and arranged his Gospel from the material of his own reminiscences. This is the reason why he speaks so little of Christ’s Galilean ministry, and so much of His contests with the Jewish mind in Jerusalem; and why, as Weisse incorrectly puts it, ‘this Gospel makes almost all the occurrences it relates take place at Jerusalem’ (p. 122).

Weisse sees also, in the connection of the didactic parts, marks of a compiler’s hand, and indeed of one who has but little independence of mind. ‘On actual investigation,’ says he, ‘the forced and laboured occasions for certain sayings and longer discourses, the frequently halting, and never really successful manner of the dialogue, the utter incomprehensibleness of many sayings and apophthegms, in the connection in which they are given, cannot but strike us.’ The critic then brings forward proofs, viz., examples in which the said incongruities between questions and answers are said to appear. One is met with, he says, in chap. ii. 4, where Jesus gives the well-known answer to His mother’s observation: ‘they have no wine.’ That this answer is difficult to explain, cannot be denied. But this is owing to another property than incongruity; for as far as this is concerned, it is evident that the answer strictly refers to Mary’s remark. Weisse finds a second incongruity in chap. iii. 5. His discovery concerning this passage is in the highest degree striking. When Nicodemus asked, ‘How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother’s womb and be born?’ and Jesus answered, ‘He must be born of water and of the Spirit;’ we have surely a correction of the most direct kind. It will not, we feel, be necessary to go through the critic’s whole catalogue in this manner.

The narrative parts of this Gospel, which, according to Weisse, must be entirely set down to a ‘compiler,’ are next said to exhibit an utter absence of any general view. ‘An error of judgment in our Evangelist of the kind referred to, both with respect to the relation of Jesus to the Jewish people, and His manner of discoursing and method of teaching, in the presence of His disciples and opponents, testifies more plainly against him who thus errs, than all his details in particulars testify for him.’ Concerning this supposed error of judgment in the Evangelist, the critic might be sufficiently corrected by the cross as it appears in the statements of the synoptists, but especially by the plan of St John himself, which

has indeed escaped his research. The graphic nature of the narratives has often been extolled as a proof of the authenticity of this Gospel. Weisse, however, finds, in the very details which render them so, marks which make them doubtful; and, by way of example, tests the cure at Bethesda by this assertion. It is said to testify against the possibility of the narrator being an eye-witness, 'that, according to this narrative, we involuntarily receive the impression that Jesus was going about alone and unaccompanied when He met with the sick man, which seems (ver. 13) to be further confirmed by the fact, that the latter lost sight of Jesus in the crowd, as a solitary and unimportant individual.' If then it really happened thus, certainly the impression obtained by the critic may testify against the fact of John's being an eye-witness of this miracle, but not in the least against his faithful remembrance and record of a circumstance, which Jesus might possibly have related to him a quarter of an hour after its occurrence. The critic is, however, unable to furnish the slightest reason for his view; for Jesus might just as easily have withdrawn Himself from the observation of the sick man, by passing through the multitude with one or more of His disciples, as alone. The circumstance that Jesus began to question the sick man, unapplied to, is next said to excite attention, since, according to the synoptists, such was by no means His custom. But would one who was compiling a narrative so lightly have ventured to depict so original a feature? Did the peculiar character of the patient offer no reason for peculiarity of treatment? This man, who for so long a period had suffered others to take precedence of himself, who appears to have taken no special pains to find people to plunge him at the right moment into the water, who so soon after the benefit he received, lost sight of his benefactor, seems not to have possessed the energy with which many others entreated the Lord. He was not entirely helpless, for he had often attempted to profit by the troubling of the water, and to get into the pool by his own strength; but 'while I am coming,' says he, 'another steppeth in before me.' And yet no wish, no entreaty, no expectation, is heard to proceed from his mouth. No one can blame Dr Paulus if he suspects this man. That he was indeed no impostor, is shown by the readiness of the Saviour to perform this cure; he seems, however, to have been phlegmatic and irresolute in the highest degree. It was for this reason that Jesus so significantly inquires of him, 'Wilt thou be made whole?' and excites within him the desire which was so devoid of energy. The critic also finds the injunction of Christ: 'Arise, take up thy bed and walk,' 'utterly inadequate,' because the patient had already some strength, and could therefore in case of need stand up and walk. It would be but an insult to my readers to waste a word on this 'utter inadequacy.' The Jews understood the difference between his former and present walking far better. Hence they employed their casuistry in representing it as a sin, that so robust a man should be carrying his bed, an act which they had formerly

allowed to the cripple as a work of necessity. This obviates the new difficulty discovered by the critic. ‘But if it was not allowed to carry a bed on the Sabbath, how could the sick man have had his brought to the pool on that day?’ These are the kind of incidents which excite the suspicions of Weisse, in a narrative which seems to him fit to be selected as a specimen.

The free mention of the names of persons, towns, and districts by the Evangelist, forms another class of details. ‘A considerable part of these indications,’ says Weisse, ‘is so constructed, as to leave an involuntary impression that the narrator inserted them, to spare his readers the trouble it had cost him to make inquiries concerning scenes and persons.’ Among such indications are reckoned that ‘Bethsaida is called the city of Andrew and Peter;’ that when Cana is named a second time, the miracle formerly wrought there is recalled; that when Nicodemus again appears on the scene, he is designated as the same who came to Jesus by night; and others of a like character. This particularity of statement is, however, far more simply explained, by attributing it to the peculiarity of the author, than to the excessive laboriousness with which he prosecuted his studies of Gospel history, and with which he consequently imparted it to others. Could such information be so very difficult to obtain, in the later apostolic period of the Christian Church? Our critic is leading us imperceptibly beyond the sphere of the Church. Even in such a case, if the inquirer had appropriated the materials of others, it does not follow that he would impart it in the laboured manner supposed. But it well accords with the known character of St John, that he should mention with the emphasis of affection such places, for instance, as ‘Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha,—‘Lazarus whom He raised from the dead,’ and such like.

It is upon such arguments that Weisse finds his assertion, that the fourth Gospel, viewed as an historical authority, stands considerably lower than the synoptical Gospels, and must, in its general view of the character and person of Christ, and of the process of His history, be corrected by them. Though the critic does not commit himself to a distinction of the component parts of the Gospel according to their originality, yet he allows that ‘if anything in the whole composition is the work of St John, it is undoubtedly the so-called prologue (p. 134). If this prologue is regarded as an organic fragment needing completion by a corresponding organism, its nature is sufficiently manifested to enable us to infer such a completion as that furnished by the Gospel itself. The remark that such introductions to historical books are nowhere else found in the New Testament, cannot be brought forward as an argument against the unity of the fourth Gospel. The prologue harmonizes, both in style and view, with the whole work. Nevertheless, it is said to be an independent fragment. How far more does the prologue to the third Gospel differ from the Gospel which it precedes! and yet it is universally admitted as a component part. It certainly does

need patience to follow the endless caprices, the tricks and turns of modern critical argumentation, for even a short distance.

The Tübingen school has declared, by the votes of a whole series of authors, against the genuineness of the fourth Gospel. The train of argument by which Schwegler, in his work, *Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, p. 183, opposes the authenticity of this Gospel, may be regarded as an expression of sympathy with this criticism. The first argument proceeds upon the assertion, that the Johannean doctrine of the Trinity, as far as its degree of formal completeness and definiteness is concerned, anticipates the dogmatic developments of nearly two centuries. This remark is not peculiarly well adapted for placing the argument on a firm foundation. The Johannean doctrine of the Trinity certainly surpasses, both in purity and fulness, that of Sabellius and Origen; nay, it may be with truth affirmed, that it has not even yet been exhausted, in its entire ideality, by the utterances either of Christian dogmatism or of religious philosophy. It follows, that if the fact of its surpassing posterity is taken as a starting-point for such an argument, we shall find ourselves on the high road to prove that this Gospel is not written yet. The critic, indeed, himself reminds us that 'divining spirits often pass over a long series of intermediate results.' But 'he is surprised, that not only are the other books of the New Testament devoid of the Johannean doctrines of the Logos and the Paraclete, in this form, but especially, that Justin seems to have no notion of any apostolic predecessor of such a kind. As far as the other books of the New Testament are concerned, the Christology of Ephes. i. 3, &c., and Col. i. 15, &c., is essentially the same as that announced in the fourth Gospel. Originality of view and expression, however, is an essential feature in our notion of an apostle. It would have been preposterous if St Paul had used the same expressions as St John, either in this or in any other respect. And if Justin did not make his saying (*Apol. maj.*), καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν, ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, exactly conform with St John's words, chap. iii. 3, such freedom of expression is so entirely in the style of Christian antiquity, that it is quite surprising to find our author regarding this circumstance as 'a most striking proof' that he was unacquainted with this Gospel. The author supposes that 'Justin, as the sole promulgator of this doctrine in his days, would have felt bound to extend to his innovation the shield of apostolic sanction.' In this remark 'the innovation' is a pure assumption, entirely devoid of foundation. If it be for a moment granted, that the doctrine of the Logos was already known to the Church in Justin's days, through this Gospel, the whole remark falls to the ground. A second argument of this author is founded on the remark, that a decided distinction between the Logos and the Pneuma is wanting in the earlier fathers till Irenaeus, and that this distinction or dogmatic evolution does not makes its appearance before the era of this Gospel and of Montanism. It is hence

supposed ‘that both originated in one and the same sphere of theological movement.’ But here also the critic overshoots the mark in a manner which must be very inconvenient. If this confusion of the Logos with the Pneuma lasted till Irenæus, and if its abolition marks the epoch when St John’s Gospel and Montanism appeared, both must have been subsequent to Irenæus. With respect to the relation of the fourth Gospel to Montanism, the author brings forward the similarity between the theories of the Montanists and of St John concerning the Paraclete, in which respect he refers to Baur, *Trinitätslehre*, p. 164. In this case, such similarities are mentioned as, that both systems represent the Paraclete as the revealer of futurity, that both give prominence to His judicial agency. The author has indeed a feeling of the difference between the fourth Gospel and Montanism with regard to the Paraclete. ‘There we find the tranquil mysterious feature of Christian gnosis, here the coarse reality of the formal dead; there Christian consciousness in its peaceful untroubled perfection, here in its wild, enthusiastic current,’ &c. (p. 189). Yet he thinks, p. 204, he cannot but bring up the question as a dilemma, whether the Gospel is the postulate and relative factor of Montanism, or *vice versa*; and arrives at the result, that the Gospel seeks to mediate ‘between Jewish and heathen Christianity, two contrasts which stand exactly opposed to each other in their most concrete forms and sharpest distinctness, as Montanism and Gnosticism,—to admit both extremes in a transfigured form into the Church, and to point out the correct evangelical medium between them. Apart from the fact that the strongest expression of judaized Christianity is contained, not in Montanism, but in Ebionitism, we would ask, how could this Gospel so mediate between the mutilated Christology of the Montanists, which made the Son inferior to the Pneuma and the Doceticism of the Gnostics, that the Catholic doctrine of the Son of God, and of His perpetual presence in the Church, should be the result? How could it be possible to find any correct evangelical medium between the constrained and morbid asceticism of the Montanists, and the gloomy asceticism of the Gnostics which misconceived the corporeity? The author himself seems to produce but an extremely one-sided medium, one namely which accuses judaized Christianity as savouring of Marcionism (p. 210), and favours heathenized Christianity, by *struggling towards* the conclusion, that ‘according to the Gospel, it was only a spiritual body in which the risen Saviour appeared to His disciples.’ How the author can reconcile the Marcionism which he fancies he finds in the Gospel, with such passages as John v. 39 and viii. 39, it is not easy to perceive. He should have more explicitly stated what he understands by a ‘spiritual body,’ having shortly before remarked, that the risen Saviour insists upon the ‘materiality of His mode of existence more strongly here than in St Luke.’ This, at all events, is certain, that the fourth Gospel could as little introduce into the Church a judaized

Christian as a heathenized Christian ‘extreme’ which it had ‘transfigured;’ and, least of all, that having committed itself to so erroneous an enterprise, it would be able to maintain its canonicity. The Gospels know nothing of finding this kind of happy medium among themselves, which the author is so taken with. The fact is, that Christianity, even in apostolic times, could not but, from the very first, contend against both the christianized Jewish and christianized heathen views of the world, and oppose these delusions. Its mediation consisted in developing and defining its own nature in opposition to both. With respect to the principal matter, it is not difficult to see that the Paraclete of St John is very different from that of Montanus. The former appears in the world contemporaneously with the glorification of Christ by His death and resurrection (John vii. 39); the latter appears in the Church with the person of Montanus,¹ or with the establishment of his school (*Tertullian, de virginibus velandis*, c. 1).² The former comes as the remembrancer; He speaks not of Himself; He brings no new revelation, but glorifies, as its vital principle, the living unity of the Gospel history (John xiv. 26, chap. xvi. 13). The latter does not appear as a remembrancer of the Gospel history, but rather extinguishes the remembrance of the past and the present, and makes new communications to mankind.³ Finally, the former finds no church or kingdom different from that of the Son; He brings no third revelation to surpass the revelations of the Father and the Son, but completes the one perpetual revelation of the Father by the Son, to the Church (John xvii.). The latter, on the contrary, is interested in making his revelation appear as a new, another, a third one; and they who proclaim it, separate themselves from the Church universal.⁴ From these essential differences, which manifest plainly enough the contrast between the mature catholic historic life, and the gloomy enthusiasm of separatism, a multitude of minor ones may be developed, as, for instance, the difference between the healthy energy of the spiritual life in St John’s Gospel, and the morbid, nay, convulsive passivity of the spiritual life of the Montanists. No further detail, however, is needed to destroy the illusion that Montanism is to be regarded as the postulate, and relatively as the factor, of the fourth Gospel.

¹ Among the reasons for doubting the historical personality of Montanus, Schwegler brings forward especially, the fact that one of the fathers reproaches him with adultery, while another speaks of his emasculation (p. 241). When Isidor Pelus., however, says, ‘*Η Μοντανοῦ βλασφημία παιδοκτονίαις, μοιχείαις τε καὶ εἰδωλολατρείαις συντίθεται*,’ it is evident that the reproaches cast upon his doctrine, and not upon his life, are intended. Otherwise he is accused of even infanticide and idolatry in the literal sense of the words. His doctrine might, indeed, well be designated adulterous, because it caused wives to leave their husbands; through spiritualistic enthusiasm, in order to follow the leadings of the sect. Even *παιδοκτονίαι* can only be understood in this sense.

² Per Evangelium (justitia) efferbuit in juventutem. Nunc per paracletum componitur in maturitatem.

³ Tertullian, *adv. Marcion*, iv. 22; *De virg. vel. cap. i.* ‘ad meliora proficitur.’

⁴ Euseb. *Hist. eccles.* v. cap. 16-19.

This author brings forward the well-known question concerning the day on which the Lord celebrated His last Passover, as a prominent difficulty in the way of acknowledging the genuineness of the fourth Gospel (p. 191). According to Irenæus and Polykrates, St John and the Asiatic Church were accustomed to keep Easter in the night of the 14th and 15th Nisan, after the Jewish fashion. ‘But what,’ says the author, ‘if the same John, in his Gospel, makes the 14th the day of Christ’s death, and the 13th that of His last Passover, thus depriving the date of the Eastern celebration of Easter of its ecclesiastical and historical sanction?’ ‘This is, then,’ says Bretschneider, ‘an evident contradiction; and since the attestation of this fact stands upon a firmer basis than that of St John’s Gospel, this contradiction becomes an evidence of the non-authenticity of the latter.’ The author thinks that the evident purpose of this Gospel is to oppose the Judaic-Christian Passover which was customary in Asia Minor. Its origin must therefore, in any case, date from the middle to the end of the second century. On the other hand, it may be asked, how could Tatian already appeal to four recognized Gospels in support of his work on the Gospels, if this Gospel did not appear till his own days, and was then intended to oppose so powerful a tendency as that of the Asiatic Church? Or how could Irenæus reprove the Romish bishop, Victor, for making the time of the celebration of Easter a subject of contention, if he could not but know that the fourth Gospel took up the same position as Victor, and if he highly prized this Gospel, and gave it an equal rank with the other three? How speedily must this polemical Gospel have gained universal respect in the Church, if in the time of Apollinaris, A.D. 170, it had to struggle for it in Lesser Asia from an antagonistic stand-point, and had in the time of Irenæus, about A.D. 200, and even earlier, obtained general recognition in the Church? We must, moreover, contemplate the incidents in which this opposition on the part of the fourth Gospel is said to appear. The assumption (p. 196) that even the meaning of the celebration of Easter itself was quite differently understood by the Eastern and Western Churches, may be demurred to. The Eastern Church was as little Jewish as the Western; and it is therefore incorrect to say that ‘the Oriental Easter had no other meaning and no other authority than that of being a continuation of the Jewish rite, which had no specifically Christian signification.’ The legalism of the Oriental celebration referred entirely to the time, not to the meaning of Easter.¹ This must have appeared the same to the Christian Church everywhere, according to the maturity of the Christian spirit (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). It is quite in keeping that the death of Christ, the body of the dying Redeemer, should be spoken of under the image of the paschal lamb (John xix. 33–37). The Jewish Christians would have been Talmudists,

¹ It was for this very reason that the adherents of the Eastern manner received the name of Quartodecimians, which would have been no distinctive term if the parties had differed concerning the meaning of the festival.

if the intimate relation between this death and its type had escaped them ; and the critic, in fact, most unjustly assumes that such talmudistic unbelief existed in the churches of Asia Minor. The peculiar difficulties lie in the passages quoted, which refer to the Lord's last celebration of the Passover. Why did some of the disciples think that by the words, ' That thou doest, do quickly,' Judas was bidden by the Lord to buy what was needed for the feast ? This could not have been possible unless the commencement of the feast had been already at hand, that is, unless it had been the evening of the fourteenth Nisan. If it had been the thirteenth, there would be no reason for the pressing word : do quickly. Purchases could then have been made till the evening of the following day, since the feast would not begin till the evening of the fourteenth. But if it were on this evening, it might seem to some, on hearing the words, that Judas had too long delayed the purchase of what was necessary for the feast, and that Jesus was urging him to provide for it as speedily as possible. Then, indeed, the words *ῶν χρείαν ἔχομεν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν* do not refer to the paschal lamb itself, but to what was wanted besides for the whole feast, which, in this circle, would probably be provided just before its commencement. This view of the passage also answers to the words (chap. xiii. 1), which have been considered the beginning of these difficulties with respect to the time of the last Passover : *Πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐλίγλυθεν αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα, ἵνα μεταβῇ ἐκ τοῦ κοσμου τούτου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, &c.* We are here transported to the moment in which, on one hand, the celebration of the Passover, on the other, the hour when Jesus should depart out of this world unto the Father, were at hand. This departing out of the world is the New Testament parallel to the Old Testament departure of the children of Israel from Egypt, and the word seems chosen by the Evangelist with reference to that departure. The night of the real, and of the typical departure are identical : it is the night on which the fifteenth Nisan begins. The departure, the redemption, and the deliverance or salvation from death by the atoning blood on which this redemption was founded, are, both in the celebration of the Passover and in the Lord's Supper, the principal matter, the primary, or at least the commemorative idea. Neither the death of the typical lamb, nor the death of the true Paschal Lamb, Christ Jesus, were actually represented, but assumed in the celebrations, as the event on which they were founded.¹ Thus the killing of the paschal lamb took place on the fourteenth Nisan, not as being the festival itself, but as a préparation for the festival, which was itself held on the evening of the fourteenth Nisan, i.e., at the

¹ This remark must be carefully taken into account in our doctrinal estimate of the Lord's Supper. The eating of the sacrificed lamb was not the sacrifice itself, but the feasting upon the sacrifice ; a solemnity which looks back with gratitude to the sacrifice already offered. This is also the case in the Lord's Supper, it is the enjoyment of the results of the sacrifice. It is according to this fact that the Romish doctrine of the Supper needs to be reformed.

beginning of the fifteenth Nisan. It was on this day of the month also that the Lord's Supper was instituted ; for the death of Jesus was then celebrated in anticipation. If it be asked why, if Christ considered the paschal lamb a type of His death, did He not command His disciples to celebrate the Supper after His death ? it may be answered, that this ideality is in conformity with the New Testament. It is just a sealing of that more obscure Old Testament ideality, by which the pious spirit looked, in the celebration of the Passover, to something greater than the preservation in Egypt, and the deliverance from the house of bondage, by which, indeed, it had anticipatively celebrated the death of Christ. Hence Christ also connects His Supper with the Passover, and causes the one to come forth from the other, as the full-blown rose does from the perfected bud. The moment was at hand when Jesus began to wash His disciples' feet : hence John says, ' Before the feast of the Passover.' The washing of their feet was to be, to the disciples, the introduction to that holy night. If it had taken place a whole day before the Passover, they could not have seen in it a distinct reference to that festival. The best support which the reasoning of this author seems to find, is the remark, made by the Evangelist, concerning the Jews who led Jesus before Pilate, that they themselves went not into the judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled, *ἀλλ’ ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα*. If these words are regarded as strictly referring to the eating of the paschal lamb, Christ must certainly have been crucified on the fourteenth Nisan, and have partaken of the Last Supper with His disciples on the preceding day. But it is questionable whether *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα* is to be thus strictly interpreted. Some, especially Lightfoot and Bynæus, refer these words 'to the so-called Chagiga, or the sacrifice combined with still more cheerful rejoicing, which took place before the close of the first day of the Passover.'¹ Lücke does not, however, consider this view a correct one. Bynæus remarks, that since the defilement incurred by entering the house of a Gentile would only have lasted *one* day, these Jews would not have feared it, if the eating of the paschal lamb were to take place in the evening, that is, on the next day. Lücke, on the contrary, observes that Bynæus only supposes, but does not prove, that entrance into a Gentile house involved only the day's defilement. This may, however, be settled by reference to the passages, Acts x. 11, &c., and Lev. xi. 23, &c. It is certain that it had become a custom among the Jews to extend the law concerning defilement by dead unclean animals, to defilement by Gentile habitations. Bynæus and Lightfoot, however, if they extended the expression *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα* beyond its first and strictest meaning, need not have limited it to the sacrificial meal of the first day. The author of the essay *Zu dem Streite über das letzte Mahl des Herrn (Evang. Kirchenzeitung, 1838, No. 98)* rightly remarks : ' The expression, to eat the Passover, designates the consumption of the paschal food in the whole

¹ Compare Lücke, *Commentar über das Evangelium des Johannes*, 2d Edit., p. 620.

extent of its meaning. This consisted of a lamb, with bitter herbs and unleavened bread, on the first day of the Passover ; and for the remaining days, first of unleavened bread, and secondly of peace-offerings.' It may, however, certainly be assumed that the words *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα* must gradually have obtained the same significance in Jewish ears as, to celebrate the Passover. Christians celebrate the *Supper* and Christmas (*Weihnacht*) in the middle of the day ; the Romanist says, I am fasting, when he eats fish on Friday. Fasting is the definite notion ; the eating of fish is incidental. And thus, in the Jewish Passover, the eating of the lamb was the root from which the whole feast arose, and so far the whole festival might be included in this expression. We are not then obliged to understand here one definite meal, the desire to partake of which caused the Jews to hesitate at entering the Praetorium. They desired to keep themselves ceremonially clean during the feast; and it was a special part of their observance of the Passover to avoid the Gentile hall of judgment during the middle of the fifteenth Nisan, the feast having already commenced. In further proof of a discrepancy between St John and the synoptists, concerning the time of the Passover, it is also said, that the former twice says of the day of Christ's death, that it was *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* (chap. xix. 14, 31) (p. 200). The statement of the author is here inaccurate. In chap. xix. 14, we find *ἥν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*; while in ver. 31, on the contrary, we have *ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἥν*; and this latter word is referred to the preceding : *ἴνα μὴ μείνῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ*. Thus it is evident that preparation, *παρασκευὴ*, is here a stereotyped expression, to denote the day before the Sabbath, the Friday ; and that the preparation of the Passover, in this connection, cannot denote the time of preparation for the Passover, but only the Friday occurring during the time of its celebration. Finally, the question, why this Evangelist does not relate the institution of the Lord's Supper, must be answered by a glance at the construction of this Gospel. In any case, it can as little be adduced as a proof of non-authenticity, as, e.g., the circumstance that the institution of baptism is not related. We might even ask the critic how it happened that the whole ancient Church did not perceive the antagonism of this Gospel to the statements of the three first Gospels, with respect to the time of Christ's last celebration of the Passover, or that, if they did, they accepted the latter without difficulty ? Polemic subtleties which were unobserved by the Church, which were never brought forward against the Quartodecimians, could never have been the actual motive of this Gospel. On this assumption, either the Evangelist ill understood polemics, or the Church ill understood polemic expressions.

Another mark of non-authenticity has been found by this critic in the relation of the fourth Gospel to the Apocalypse. 'The Apostle John,' says he, 'is the undeniable author of the Apocalypse. History bears the strongest and most emphatic testimony to this

fact.' But since it is merely assumed, and not proved, that the Apocalypse is heterogeneous to the Gospel of John, it will be unnecessary to bring forward what has been elsewhere said against this assumption.¹ This might, indeed, be a good opportunity of keeping 'criticism' to its word with respect to its concession regarding the Apocalypse. Such an attempt, however, would be but labour lost. So long as the conclusions it arrives at vary almost from man to man, and from five years to five years; so long as it turns every defective and contorted view into an argument, it would feel much astonished at being kept to its conclusions.

If we would, however, be convinced that criticism is rushing onwards on a suicidal course, we must contemplate the ever varying and ever transient results to which it 'advances,' till we at length stand with it upon the dizzy height, whence it plunges into the abyss of shame. It brings the Gospels, as far as their origin is concerned, within reach of the apocryphal region, driving them from the centre to the limits of Christendom, till it finally places them in a position in which, like offended spirits, they turn and sit in judgment upon their insolent and perplexed judge.

According to Weisse, the Gospel of St John was the work of some unknown compiler, who made use of certain records, still extant, from the hand of the Apostle John, and consisting of isolated reflections relating to the life of Jesus. These reflections are themselves, however, 'the laboured product of the disciple's mind, in its endeavour to seize that image of his Master which was threatening to dissolve into a misty form, to re-collect its already vanishing features, and to cast them in a new mould, by the help of a self-formed or borrowed theory concerning that Master's nature and destination :' p. 110. The Gospel itself is said not to have been composed till a later period, and by a compiler living at a time remote from the matters it treats of.

According to Schwegler, the Gospel of St John belongs to a series of reformatory writings which, appearing about the middle of the second century, mark the commencement of a reaction against Judaism. But it was the manner of such attempts, especially when they were united with peaceful aims, to arrogate *that apostolic authority which was on their adversaries' side* in favour of their own tendency, and by cutting away the ground under the feet of the opposing party, to preserve the common apostolic point of union (p. 214). Here, then, this Gospel is, in fact, but a spurious work, imputed to the Apostle John, the patch-work of an impostor opposing apostolic relations.

According to Bauer, the Gospels are poetic productions of the Evangelists, founded on the Christian consciousness of the Church. In this inventive agency, Mark has retained the largest amount of

¹ E.g., in my *Vermischten Schriften*, vol. ii. p. 173, &c. In the theological annual edited by Dr Zeller (No. iv. p. 657), my view of the Apocalypse is dismissed as an allegorical interpretation. It seems that the critic is not yet clear upon the difference existing between an allegorical interpretation, and an interpretation of the allegorical.

genuineness, Luke has surpassed Mark, and Matthew, Luke. ‘The fourth’ leaves all the rest behind him. ‘When a scarecrow is pulled to pieces, and the purpose for which it was set up is perceived, there is nothing more of it left,’ says he, in a pause during the process of ‘pulling to pieces’ ‘the history of the resurrection of Lazarus’ (*Krit.* vol. iii. 185). So unsuccessful, in his opinion, is the work of the fourth Evangelist. He thus also characterizes him: ‘The unnamed writer is an airy vision, an airy vision first formed by the fourth himself; and, in this instance, the fourth has for once made a lucky hit, by giving his composition such an author. At first he sought to make it appear that there was another Gospel, derived from an eye-witness, and in fact written by one. An airy vision, however, would be the only fitting author of such a writing as the fourth has handed down to us.’¹ Lützelberger² exports the Gospel which has been called the heart of Christ still further. According to him, the fourth Gospel (see Weisse) is all of a piece, in contrast to the synoptists, who exhibit a ~~typic~~^{mosai}, unequal appearance, and in whose writings differing tones and strange discrepancies appear. This Gospel is said to have originated in Edessa, or its neighbourhood, a distant part of Asia. ‘The author of this Gospel,’ argues the critic, ‘could not possibly have been acquainted with the form of the Gospel history, as handed down by the three other Gospels.’ But this is accounted for, when it is known ‘that it originated on the other side of the Euphrates, and therefore beyond the limits of the Roman power,’³ where the influence of the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome was not so considerable. Thus this Gospel is said to have arisen as far as possible beyond that sphere of existence which was more peculiarly that of the Church! The pretended polemical views of the Gospel are also said to support the assumption of the author. He finds much that is warped in the external polemical tendencies of this Gospel, because its inner nature, its idea, and the vital unity with which this is carried out, are hidden from him. First of all, for instance, the Gospel is said polemically to oppose John’s disciples. ‘It is shown with all possible care, that John the Baptist absolutely declared, that not himself but Jesus was the Christ.’ ‘It must, however, be remembered, that the Sabaeans, or disciples of John, were spread over Galilee, Syria, and the farther parts of the Parthian region, since they still exist in Persia.’ The Gospel is further said to oppose the Docetae (p. 276). Now Syria and Mesopotamia were well known as the special seats of Docetism. The author therefore ought, in fairness, to have shown how it happened that, in a church which was originally thoroughly Docetic, a Gospel should have originated, spread, and been accepted, which entirely opposed this tendency. The author, however,

¹ Vol. iii. p. 340.

² Lützelberger: *Die Tradition über den Apostel Johannes und seine Schriften in ihrer Grundlosigkeit nachgewiesen von Lützelberger*, Leipzig, 1840.

³ According to Lützelberger, Matthew’s Gospel originated in Egypt, Luke’s in Antioch, Mark’s in Rome.

is so little acquainted with the specific nature of Docetism as a necessary result of that dualistic principle, which opposes to the good principle, the evil principle existing in matter, that he further on makes the author of the Gospel himself a Docetic. The earthly, the coarse material, is in this Gospel that which is opposed to the divine, which is subdued and subjected to the power of evil, to the prince of the world (p. 284). ‘The doctrine of the Logos, or the doctrine of the good Lord of heaven, necessarily introduced the opposite doctrine of the evil Lord of the world:’ p. 286. And this Evangelist, who is thus himself a Docetist, is said to have opposed Docetism. This is the position whence ‘criticism’ plunges into the abyss!

The pious Hans Sachs, after long misconception and abuse, found an ‘apologist’ in Göthe, when he said,

‘In Froschpfuhl all das Volk verbannt,
Das seinen Meister je verkannt.’

The misconception and ill-treatment which ‘the fourth’ has so often experienced in our days, will perhaps soon call forth a general disposition in theology and science to apply this sentence of Göthe to those critics who have misconceived St John. At any rate these critics have to deal with a very different John from the venerable Master Hans of Nuremberg.

NOTES.

1. In the work, *Das Evangelium Johannes nach seinem innern Werthe und seiner Bedeutung für das Leben Jesu Kritisch untersucht von Dr Alex. Schweizer*, the genuineness of this Gospel is, on the whole, maintained; at the same time, however, the hypothesis that this Gospel is interspersed with interpolations, which are the work of a later hand, and designed to contribute a somewhat Galilean addition, is carried out with much ingenuity. Considerable difficulties are, however, opposed to this hypothesis, even when but generally considered. It might fairly be asked, How could this Gospel have been so abundantly interpolated without this circumstance having been, at any time, or in any manner, noticed in the Church? If it had been interpolated before its propagation in the Church, John was mistaken in those to whose care he committed his work. If it were interpolated subsequently, it might be expected that manuscripts must be found which would support the original against the subsequent form of this Gospel; as, on the other hand, it is generally in this manner that subsequent additions are discovered. It may be further asked, Why should the original form be devoid of a Galilean element? The Evangelist might indeed have had a plan which led him more especially to depict the ministry of Jesus in Judea, but could hardly have formed one which would induce him to exclude events which took place in Galilee. Was the interpolator already acquainted with the offence which modern criticism would take at the lack of the Galilean

element in John, and desirous to obviate it beforehand? Could he misconceive the completeness of this Gospel? We would point to this completeness as a fact which decides the question. If it is once recognized, no place is found for admitting interpolations. The author starts with the ' appended twenty-first chapter.' He finds in the passage, chap. xx. 30, the formal conclusion, and considers the twenty-first chapter to be appended in a manner unprecedented in the Gospels. Now it cannot be denied, that the passage in question does form a conclusion to that exhibition of the manifestations of Christ's glory, which were designed to call forth faith in Him. But it may be asked, whether the fundamental idea which guided the Evangelist in the composition of this Gospel, might not admit an epilogue, as a counterpoise to the prologue which introduced it. The prologue sets forth the eternal life of Christ, preceding His appearance in the world; the epilogue seems intended to represent His spiritual government in the world, as it was to continue after His return to the Father. To the prehistoric life of Christ, John the Baptist is the chosen witness. In conformity with his custom of representing the general by significant particulars, the Evangelist names him only, though many more testified to the coming of Christ. To His post-historic life the disciples Peter and John testify, as two strongly contrasted representatives of all the conflicts and triumphs of the kingdom of God. In the life of Peter, Christ specially manifests Himself as the ever present Lord of His Church; in the life of John, as the Lord of glory who will shortly return from heaven. Such an epilogue completes the circle, in which the end of this Gospel significantly and definitely unites with its beginning, the prologue. The author then proceeds upon the assumption that the verses 24, 25 of chap. xxi. are an addition by a later hand,—an assumption which we will admit without discussion. This concluding remark, however, is next said to show that the appended narratives are from the same later hand. 'He is conscious of having appended a narrative, and therefore assures us that it would be possible to make an infinity of insertions.' We may, however, rest assured, that any one who felt it possible to narrate so much, would not have contented himself with the addition of *one* narrative to the Gospel, when he had, moreover, once made a beginning; while, on the other hand, he would hardly have selected from his materials a narrative so emphatically a concluding one. Secondly, it is said that John could not himself have corrected the report circulated among the disciples in the manner indicated. Why not? All that is done is to set aside a false and superficial interpretation of a deeply significant saying of Christ, and this can by no means appear 'word-splitting,' even though it does not at the same time give the correct meaning. Thirdly, the narratives are said to be of a legendary kind, and not related in the style of the Apostle John. But let, e.g., chap. xxi. 7 be compared with chap. xx. 4, and how minutely are they in accordance! Such a transaction as here takes place between Christ and Peter, could not possibly have arisen in the

realm of the legendary, nor was there any of the disciples who would have so entirely understood and preserved its whole depth, power, and tenderness, as John. With respect to the style of this paragraph, Credner, after enumerating the expressions which are not in the style of this apostle, in the paragraph chap. vii. 23–viii. 11, says, ‘Chap. xxi. presents appearances of an entirely different kind. There is not one single external testimony against it; and regarded from an internal point of view, this chapter exhibits almost every peculiarity of John’s style.’ The passage chap. xix. 35–37 is further regarded as an interpolation. Here the Perfect *μεμαρτύρηκε* is thought striking. But the Evangelist might well thus express himself with reference to the fact, that as an Evangelist he had, throughout the course of a long life, laid great stress upon this striking circumstance; and he designates his *μαρτυρία* as *ἀληθινή*, because as believing testimony, it had been united to and penetrated by its object. It was because his *μαρτυρία* had this veracity that ‘he knoweth that he saith true’ (*ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγει*). The constant vigour and accuracy of his memory is derived from his living in the truth. Nor can the choice of the adjective *ἀληθινός* be regarded as a mark of want of genuineness. The addition *ἴνα καὶ ὑμεῖς πιστεύσητε* is certainly striking, and can only be explained by the fact, that John attributed great importance to the circumstance that the legs of the crucified Jesus were not broken (ver. 33). That this circumstance should strike him as a wonderfully minute coincidence between the treatment of the typical, and the history of the true Paschal Lamb, and should be a powerful confirmation of his faith, is entirely consistent with the ‘ideal’ John; and this ‘external matter’ could scarcely seem to him anything else but a real manifestation of so specially ideal an incident. The importance attached by this Evangelist to the recognition that Christ was the true antitype of the paschal lamb (chap. i. 29, 36, vi. 53, &c., xiii.), appears from several passages of this Gospel. Hence it must have been significant in his eyes, that even this solitary fact, that the legs of the crucified Saviour were not broken, should designate Him as the Paschal Lamb. Why should not this sense for the significant have been specially characteristic of John, whose custom it ever is to seize the general in the particular, in the decidedly concrete, or whenever a clearly purposed symbolism offers the opportunity? The paschal lamb was the sacrificial repast of travellers, of fugitives; it referred to non-ritual sacrifice. This circumstance was specially expressed by the fact that it was roasted whole, that a bone of it was not broken (Ex. xii. 46). This symbolical trait was repeated in the case of the corpse of Jesus. It also was not treated according to law by the civil authorities, and still less sacrificed according to the Levitical ritual; but was a sacrifice which, during the most violent storm of the world’s history, was offered ‘without the camp,’ in strict historical reality, for the redemption of His people. This agreement between the type and the reality is so speaking, that another than John would scarcely have remarked upon it.—Among lesser interpolations this

author further includes chap. xviii. 9. The words *ἴνα πληρωθῆ* seem to him to be not happily applied to the passage John xvii. 12, because here a bodily, there a spiritual, preservation is spoken of. ‘This intermixture or confusion of bodily with spiritual destruction, is in glaring opposition to the thoughtful and ideal tone of this Gospel.’ But what if, in their bodily preservation at this time, the Evangelist saw the pledge of their spiritual preservation, as was in fact the case? (comp. John xii. 36; Luke xxii. 31, 32.) Offence is further taken at the remark of the disciples (xvi. 30), that Jesus knew all things, because it relates to the fact that He anticipated their objections and questions. The apostle, however, is here pointing out an important moment, namely, that in which the light first burst upon the disciples, that Jesus must leave them. It dawned upon them, however, by means of the disclosure in ver. 28; and in the fact that Jesus had given them certainty by this disclosure, they recognized the omniscience of His insight of the uncertainty of their minds, and of the depths of truth.—Chap. ii. 21, 22 is also said to testify to ‘the same alien spirit.’ The author first considers the interpretation of the words (ver. 19) *λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον*, &c., which John gives in ver. 21 as his own (‘But He spake of the temple of His body’), as incorrect. He asks, Could John have so expounded them, and moreover have called this the exposition of the disciples, when the correct meaning—viz., ‘the destruction of the Jewish form of the theocracy, and the establishment of a purer one’—appears in Acts vi. 14, &c.? The difficulty which exegetes have for some time found in this passage disappears at once, when it is considered that, from the evangelical point of view, the destruction of the Old Testament theocracy and the destruction of Christ’s body must appear identical. It was only by the death of Christ that the Old Testament form of the theocracy was legally dissolved (Rom. vii. 4). The Jews could not put Christ to death, without at the same time spiritually casting a brand into their temple. From that time forth it was doomed to destruction, and the Old Covenant abolished. It could not have been legally abolished in any other manner than by condemning Christ by a hierarchically legitimate proceeding. John therefore perceived here also, the deep relation between type and antitype.—The critic then proceeds to the examination of the longer passages which he regards as interpolated; among which he reckons the miracle at Cana (ii. 1-12), the healing at Capernaum (iv. 44-54), the miracle of the loaves and fishes (vi. 1-26)—*i.e.*, the history both of the miracle itself, and of the return across the lake.

First, the miracle of Cana is said to stand in opposition to what is said, chap. i. 52, of the greater works of Christ which were to follow the *σημεῖον*, ver. 51. This miracle, however, can hardly oppose the expectation of those greater works of Christ, which had been previously excited. The first argument rests upon a view of the meaning of miracles, according to which a distinction is made in an abstract manner between these and the agency of Christ upon the

spiritual life. It is further adduced, as a fact unexampled in the writings of John, that the whole occurrence contains neither a discourse, nor conversation of Jesus. This remark is however opposed, e.g., by chap. v. 5-9. This miracle is also designated as one utterly magical, and, 'in a moral sense, scarcely conceivable.' This miracle is certainly one of the most difficult, but it only follows that it makes large demands upon the patience and confidence of the penetrating and exegetical mind. Finally, it is said, that the belief here exhibited by Mary, is inconsistent with the unbelief subsequently ascribed to 'His brethren' (and Mary). And Mary? Even His brethren (chap. vii.) were only unbelieving in that higher sense, in which the impatience and self-will of a superstitious belief appears to the evangelical mind as unbelief. The other remarks are easily dismissed. It can surely offer no difficulty that Jesus had been invited with His disciples, although it is not known how this was done, for an invitation might be given in a hundred different ways. But that His disciples are said to have 'believed in Him' after the miracle, although they believed in Him before, is an emphasis entirely consistent with this apostle's mode of expression. Among the examples cited to show that the expression *ἡ ὥρα μου*, in John, always means the hour of Christ's death, and is therefore inaptly used in this place, chap. xii. 27 might well have an opposite effect, and yet the hour is here more generally designated *ὥρα αὐτη*. What then is the meaning of this expression, but that Jesus is speaking of *His* hour, in direct opposition to the false and erroneous notions of others? Is the expression *ὁ καιρός μου* quite adapted to express this contrast, when it relates to moments? When, indeed, it does not relate to them, time is opposed to time (*ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος*, John vii. 6). So also the expression *αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα* (chap. xiii. 1) forms a contrast to the hour of the typical Passover, which was contemporaneous with that of His departure. His hour is everywhere that fixed upon for the temporal development of His life, in the counsel of God, in opposition to the calculations, wishes, and opinions of men. It is with such a reference to the divine appointment that it is said, Luke xxii. 53: *αὗτη ὑμῶν ἔστιν ἡ ὥρα*.—In the miracle of healing (iv. 44-54), a difficulty is first found in the circumstance, that it is said, ver. 43, that Jesus went into Galilee, and that His motive for so doing is explained, ver. 44, by the words: *Αὐτὸς γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν, ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἴδιᾳ πατρὶδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει*. It must, however, first of all be remarked, that the interpolator would be inconsistent not with the Evangelist, but with himself, if any general contradiction were found in the declarations of vers. 44 and 45. Hence the apparent contradiction in question can by no means be regarded as a sign of interpolation, unless the passage begins with ver. 45; but then the contradiction occurs in the passage which belongs to John, ver. 44 being connected with ver. 43. Consequently the explanation of this difficulty might be passed by; for, at all events, it advances nothing in favour of an interpolation. The connection of the pas-

sage may, however, be easily maintained, by attributing an inaccuracy of expression to the Evangelist. Jesus departs from Samaria as a traveller to Galilee in general. He does not take up His abode in Nazareth, His *πατρίς* strictly speaking, and that from the motive stated in ver. 44. At all events, *πατρίς* must be limited to His native town. For the sphere of a prophet's continual disparagement cannot be His native country, but only His native town. If then we are obliged to concede an inaccuracy of expression, it is more easily explained by the style of John, who everywhere deals in parentheses, than by supposing an interpolator beginning his matter with a contradiction (vers. 44 and 45). The passages, ver. 46, in which Cana is again designated as the place where Jesus made the water wine, and ver. 54, where this striking miracle is said to be the second that Jesus did when He was come out of Judea into Galilee, are also said to be doubtful. These traits are, however, among those which Weisse regards as peculiarities of style in the fourth Gospel. According to Weisse, therefore, these very traits are decisive for the genuineness of the passage. So inconsistent are the humours of critics! Ver. 48 is said to be still more difficult. 'How could this man, who travelled with so much confidence towards Jesus, in the expectation of a miracle, such as had not yet been seen in Galilee, have deserved from Jesus such a rebuke in answer to his believing request?' He was indeed one of those many inhabitants of Capernaum who would never have concerned himself about Jesus, who had taken up His abode among them, unless a domestic calamity had arisen; and the rebuke is expressed as mildly as possible. The man is actually corrected in a threefold manner by Jesus: first in his request that He would hasten back with him; then in his second, that He would heal his son in His usual way; thirdly, in his assertion that his son was at the point of death. The first need of the painfully excited father was tranquillity of mind, and a faith reposing on the quiet means of unexpected help. Jesus gives him this faith; hence the use of the word *τέρατα* in His reproof. It is not till he acquiesces in the form of help which Jesus points out, that he proves himself possessed of true faith. Finally, this narrative is said to be a parallel to that of the centurion in the synoptic Gospels (Matt. viii. 5), but far more indistinctly related. Too much stress is, however, laid upon the external resemblances of the two narratives; and the decided contrast they exhibit is lost sight of, when they are looked upon as identical. The centurion of the earlier Gospels merely states his distress: he is too humble to solicit Jesus to make a long journey for his sake, and too believing to think this necessary. He is almost shocked when Jesus makes him the offer of coming to heal his sick servant. In what an opposite spirit does the nobleman of St John's Gospel approach Jesus; and hence how different is the treatment he meets with! The internal character of both histories is decisive with respect to the question of their diversity. It is as little possible to confound this *βασιλικὸς* with the *ἐκατόνταρχος*, as to take two men

whom we might meet at different places one after another, and whose countenances were entirely different, for the same persons, because they both perhaps wore a red collar to their coats. For the rest, this miracle is not described merely as the second Galilean one, but as the second which Jesus wrought in returning from Judea to Galilee.

Lastly, with respect to the feeding of the multitude (vi. 1-26), it is said, first, that the miracle itself is abruptly introduced, in marked disharmony with what precedes, and in internal disconnection with what follows. It is certainly striking that the Evangelist should so suddenly change the scene. ‘Jesus was teaching in the temple at Jerusalem, ver. 47. Suddenly, and without mention of any return to Galilee, chap. vi. 1, after an indefinite *μετὰ ταῦτα*, continues with *ἀπῆλθεν πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας*,’ &c. The author’s opinion is, that the passage chap. vi. 1-26 is interpolated in the discourse which Jesus, according to chap. v., delivered in the temple, and that the discourse chap. vi., from ver. 27 to the close of the chapter, is connected with the former, and was consequently spoken in Jerusalem. If, however, we view the Gospel under this assumption, and omit the supposed interpolation, we shall find the change of scene quite as sudden as before. At the close of the fifth chapter, we find Jesus still in the temple at Jerusalem; at the beginning of the seventh, we are informed that ‘after these things Jesus walked in Galilee;’ and then, immediately thereafter, He goes again to Jerusalem; and we hear nothing of His ministry in Galilee. Thus the choice offered us is, whether we accept, according to the existing text, the sudden change of scene, with a sojourn in Galilee filled up with occurrences; or, according to the hypothesis, an equally sudden change of scene, with a sojourn utterly barren of events. We pass over the isolated expressions which are said to recall the synoptists; the indefinite *τὸ ὅπος* finds, indeed, the contrast which defines it, in the shores of the lake. The narrative is next said to be contradictory of what follows it. ‘How strange is it, that the men who had been so miraculously fed, and so struck by this deed of Jesus, that they (ver. 15) desired to take Him by force and make Him a Messianic king, should, on the very next day, encounter Him with “What sign (*σημεῖον*) shonest Thou then, that we may see and believe Thee?”’ And how still more incomprehensible is it, that they should (ver. 31) just hit upon the thought that a miracle similar to the manna would suffice them! We can point, however, to something equally ‘strange’ in the eighth chapter, where it is said, ver. 30, that ‘many believed on Him,’ and in ver. 37, that Jesus said, ‘ye seek to kill Me.’ Is not this contradiction greater? Here, however, it is to be referred to no ‘interpolator;’ but the return of such characteristic ‘singularities’ rather points to a peculiarity of view in this Evangelist, and consequently testifies to the genuineness of the present passage. That these people are so ‘strange,’ is the very fact which the writer desires to represent, Jesus Himself reproaches them with it in the words, ‘Ye seek

Me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled.' The author finds this saying striking; but it evidently arises from the thought, that the miraculous meal has two sides: as a miracle, it attracts the higher sense, by means of its spiritual element; as a meal, however, it attracts the common sense, by means of its utility. To these utilitarians, the miracle of Jesus must have appeared less than that of Moses, not merely because Jesus had made use in the miracle of a natural substratum, but because Moses had, so to speak, continuously provided for his people by the manna, and because Jesus had given them to understand that they must not seek the realization of such utilitarian ideals from Him. These people, as such, are just the *Ioudaioi* of John, and not Israelites within the limits of Judea, or 'the upper class and their dependants at Jerusalem, the mention of whom is said to betray that this discourse was originally delivered at Jerusalem.' That Jesus then, should oppose to the notions of these men, who, in the chiliastic spirit of a corrupt Judaism, would have made Him a king, the doctrine of the true bread of life, is quite what might be expected, and can by no means be regarded as inconsistent with the miracle itself, as the author supposes (p. 85). According to this supposition, the saying of Jesus, ver. 27, 'Labour not for the bread that perisheth,' must also deny the account of this miracle in the synoptical Gospels.

On the return across the lake, the author remarks, 'The whole narrative, the feeding of the multitude and the return, is, in its manner, style, indefiniteness, and lack of intuitive vision, unlike the genuine writings of John;' hereby assuming that the ordinary style of this apostle is definite and intuitive. It is, however, questionable, whether this can be affirmed of his statement of external relations in their actual connection and chronological sequence. The peculiar excellence of this apostle lies in entirely opposite qualities, and the very clumsiness of the narrative, especially vers. 22-24, might rather be adduced as a sign of the genuineness of the passage. An interpolator would have been careful to manage this crossing over more conveniently. When it is further said, ver. 16, *ώς δὲ ὥψια ἐγένετο*, and ver. 17, *σκοτίᾳ ἡδη ἐγεγόνει*, this shows no diversity of style with the expression, *οὐσῆς ὥψιας*, chap. xx. 19. In both cases, it was intended definitively to state that it was actually night. In the latter case, this would be made more evident by the circumstance *καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων*; but upon the lake such a circumstance was wanting, and it was consequently necessary to use a more definite expression. 'The five and twenty or thirty furlongs' of ver. 19 are entirely opposed to this author's conjecture, that the disciples, according to the meaning of the Evangelist, rowed along the northern shore of the lake, and that Jesus followed them on foot along this shore, and overtook them at a short distance from their destination, after they had been detained by the storm. If the passage across the lake, which amounted to forty furlongs, had been only twenty-five or thirty, it would even

then have been impossible that this circuitous route should have amounted only to the same number of furlongs. The *πλοιάρια* of ver. 23 cannot, moreover, be the ships in which the people returned, as is here believed (p. 93). The intention of the Evangelist is very clear, though his expressions are not so. When the people, on the morning after the miracle, were standing on the shore, they well knew that only one vessel had been at the disposal of Jesus and His disciples, also that only the disciples had departed in this vessel, and that Jesus was not with them. They could not, therefore, but conclude that He was still on their side of the lake, and would have sought Him there. But other ships had arrived from Tiberias, nigh unto the place where they had eaten bread, and Jesus might have used one of these for His return. As, therefore, they did not find Him, it seemed to them increasingly probable that He had used such an opportunity of crossing, and they immediately entered the ships that they might seek Him in Capernaum.

2. A very valuable contribution towards the solution of the inquiry, whether the supper spoken of John xiii. was the last Passover which Jesus celebrated with His disciples, and that connected with it, concerning the day on which Jesus died, has been furnished by Wieseler in his *Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels*. Comp. section 5 of the above-named work: *Von dem letzten königlichen Einzug Jesu in Jerusalem bis zu seinem Tode und seiner Grablegung. Die Leidenswoche.*¹

¹ [Since Wieseler's publication, other valuable contributions have been made to the solution of this important and somewhat involved question. Lichtenstein (*Lebensgeschichte*, Anmerk. 79), Riegenbach, in the ablest chapter of an excellent volume (*Vorlesungen über das Leben Jesu*, pp. 610–660, ed. 1858), and Andrews (*Life of our Lord*, pp. 369–397, ed. 1863), present all the difficulties of the subject along with sufficient material for their satisfactory solution. They agree in the conclusion, that the four Evangelists concur in asserting that the Lord ate the true paschal supper at the time when it was eaten by the Jews in general, on the evening following the 14th Nisan; and that the Friday on which He was crucified was the 15th, and therefore the first Sabbath of the feast. With this general conclusion Fairbairn agrees (*Hermeneutical Manual*, p. 334), though with some interesting differences in the argument, and without so full a treatment of all the points usually discussed. Ellicott, however (*Hist. Lectures*, p. 122), still holds to the opinion of the Greek fathers, that He suffered on the 14th, and consequently ate the paschal supper on the eve with which that day commenced. He does not, however, present his reasoning in much detail.—ED.]

PART VI.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

SECTION I.

VARIOUS VIEWS OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

A DEFINITE historical tradition concerning the origin of the four Gospels is in existence, and has already been the subject of our discussion. This tradition explains the most essential peculiarities of the four Gospels; viz., that Matthew keeps so closely to the Hebrew national consciousness; that Mark is not so exact about the chronological sequence of his statements; that Luke has so much that is catholic, and consistent with the point of view of Gentile Christianity; and, lastly, that John furnishes us with so few of the circumstances communicated by the other three, because his intention was to supply what they had omitted.

The modern scientific consideration of the Gospels finds this tradition insufficient to explain the remarkable phenomenon exhibited by the relation of the four Gospels to each other, viz., that, on the one hand, they present a unity as complete as if they were but one work; and, on the other, as much diversity as if neither were aware of the existence of the other.

Various explanations have been given, especially in the work of Gieseler: *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien* (p. 30, &c.).¹

The first attempt at explaining this phenomenon insists upon regarding one writing as the primitive Gospel, the matter of which is said to be the basis of each separate synoptical Gospel. Some have considered that this primitive basis was formed by the original Gospel of Matthew, others by the so-called Gospel of the Hebrews, and others again by an original Aramaean Gospel. Eichhorn considers that compilations from this primitive Gospel originated the three first Gospels. Such an origin of the Gospels is, however, so artificial and far-fetched, that it can scarcely be understood how it was possible that the critic could recognize such a monstrosity of compilation in the first models of the free and beautiful originality

¹ Lately also in the copious work of Ebrard, *Gospel History*, p. 21.

of the New Testament, the hideous mask of a literary corpse in these firstlings of a specifically new literary life.¹ The Gospels are equally regarded as still-born, compiled productions without originality, when either the Gospel of Matthew, or that of Mark, or that of Luke, is looked upon as the basis on which the others were formed. But this dead fabrication system has been applied not merely to the relation of the second and third Gospels to the supposed first, but also to the relation of the third to the supposed second. According to such suppositions, the second Evangelist made use of the work of the first, and the third of the works of the second and first, in compiling his own. Concerning the order, however, in which this paralytic authorship took place, as many hypotheses have been formed as the transposition of the names Matthew, Mark, and Luke would furnish; *e.g.*, Matthew, Luke, Mark; Mark, Matthew, Luke, &c. This is the permutation system.² To get at the secret by means of permutation, criticism has formed a kaleidoscope of all the existing possibilities, and then shaken this kaleidoscope again and again, thus producing every possible combination in this one lifeless kind of view. Operations of this kind might perhaps compete in rigidity, insipidity, and misconception of the living originality of the said writings, with any of the performances of a talmudic-rabbinical style of treatment. A more striking instance of the tendency to construct the fairest mystery of unity in variety, and variety in unity, the mystery of the most glorious vitality, not merely out of the deepest, but also out of the most pitiable kind of death, has seldom paraded itself in learned pomp before the world.

The view which attributes the separate or remaining Gospels to lesser evangelical writings or essays, representing single incidents in the life of Christ, or to memoirs, may be regarded as the corresponding vital counterpart to that dead assumption of a primitive Gospel which would degrade them into external compilations.³ Such a view entirely corresponds with the idea of the solemn remembrance in which this life was preserved. But the same difficulties to which the former hypothesis gave rise, are experienced when these memoirs are regarded as primitive records, which the Evangelists regarded and treated as diplomatically certain and authoritative, and not as assisting and completing the living and independent tradition of the Gospel.

Both assumptions agree in the one point of giving a written foundation to the synoptic Gospels, and are opposed to the view which accepts an oral Gospel tradition, as a new and different explanation of the phenomenon in question. Nothing is more certain,

¹ See Ebrard, p. 21. [See also a very thorough examination of this hypothesis by Andrews Norton, *Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 60, and Note D.—ED.]

² See Ebrard, p. 22; [or Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iii.; Davidson's *Introd.*, vol. i. 382 and 387; Reuss, *Geschichte d. h. Schriften*, p. 164.—ED.]

³ To this belongs Schleiermacher's view of the origin of Luke's Gospel, founded on the preface thereto.

than that the Gospel facts must have been preserved in a most powerful tradition. The Christian Church at first found its daily edification, nay, its heaven, in this tradition. But the view of its development assumes, in the field of criticism, the character of regarding this tradition as the exclusive basis of the Gospels. It is in the maintenance of this exclusiveness that this view also becomes hypothesis, and betrays its hypothetical character by running into opposite extremes. On the one hand arises the view, that tradition was gradually formed into a verbally fixed, oral Gospel, and that it thus gradually assumed a liturgical character. Here then tradition appears in its highest form, as a crystallization.¹ On the other hand appears the notion which represents Gospel tradition as the obscure stream of excited, heathenish popular imagination, which, carrying along with it a stratum of Gospel facts, or even of primitive fictions, deposited them as half or wholly 'washed-down legends,' like water-rolled pebbles against the dams of the written Gospels.²

The latest hypothesis, which regards the Gospels as productions of the Evangelists, whose minds are said to have expressed in naïve fiction the consciousness of the Church, need only be mentioned for the sake of completeness.³

It cannot but be an enigma to subsequent ages, that in an age which prided itself upon highly esteeming what was original in subjective and individual life, it could ever have come to pass, that the origin of the Gospels should be regarded as an enigma—an obscure and difficult enigma. For it is owing to the very circumstance that the vital originality of the separate Gospels has been ignored in the most unworthy manner, that this difficulty has become so great and unsolvable. The actual factor was misconceived, through misconception of the peculiarity of the Evangelists; how, indeed, could it be possible to comprehend the mutual relation of the Gospels, when this was not duly estimated? It is true that the former doctrine of inspiration had laid the foundation of this depreciation of the personal in the Gospels. As the too high demands of a former harmony brought forth the rationalistic tendency, so did the former degradation of the Evangelists produce the whole series of views, which regarded them as mere mechanical transcribers. But her own poverty and helplessness carried criticism

¹ Compare Gieseler, *Historisch-kritisch Versuch*, &c., p. 53, &c. The notion of a stereotyped oral tradition was formed especially by Kaiser. Gieseler's view is a more lively one. [Westcott very ably advocates a 'definite oral Gospel,' which was gradually formed, not by popular tradition, but by apostolic preaching; he does not, however, absolutely exclude the use of written documents, although inclining to do so. Norton (i. p. 284) maintains that 'the oral narratives of the apostles were the common archetype' of the Gospels. Davidson (i. 405 ff.) is of the same opinion, and does not differ from Westcott even in the degree that the latter seems to imagine (p. 189).—Ed.]

² So Strauss. Weisse has appropriated the expression, washed-down legend, although he shows some repugnance to the washing river, the myth-forming tradition. See his *Evangelische Geschichte*, p. 7, &c.

³ See *Kritik der evang. Geschichte*, by Bruno Bauer.

even farther than the results of this misconception prescribed. Even the factors granted were not treated in an historical manner, when it was supposed that the hypothesis of a written basis to the Gospels must overthrow the tradition-hypothesis ; and, on the other hand, that the latter could not exist in the presence of the former. For want of transposition into the scene, and of submissively accepting the appearance of the gospel-spirit in the Gospels, they have been alternately regarded as the production of one or other of a series of pale spectral forms ; and it has been insisted, that they originated in either literary compilation or a liturgical rhapsodical hymn, or the plastic formative presentiment, or finally the fixed idea of a species of poetry, which was said to have no consciousness of its artistic doings. Gospels formed in such a manner, would indeed have been far below that glowing, living, solemn remembrance which animated the apostolic Church and its Evangelists.

NOTE.

Gieseler in his above-named work, p. 35, &c., dismisses the hypothesis which would make one Gospel the basis of the others in the following words : ‘ Besides the absence of all historical grounds, these hypotheses may also be met in the following manner. (1.) It is not evident what motive could have induced the later Evangelist, if he were acquainted with the work of an able predecessor, instead of circulating the same, with the addition of a supplement if he thought it necessary, to have brought it out under his own name, after a very unimportant revision, at least with respect to its contents. (2.) In whatever order the Gospels may be arranged, there always remains in the earlier, much which the later have omitted ; yet they could not have considered this incorrect, and it would be difficult to prove that just these passages were those that were unsuitable for all classes of readers. (3.) How contrary is the work of revision which must be accepted, to the spirit of an age which produced but few authors ! Here the later Evangelist gives whole narratives and isolated sentences an entirely different position ; he must therefore have turned over his predecessor’s work, selecting first from one place, then from another. In one place he begins by transcribing verbally, and then exchanges words and thoughts ; at another time he omits thoughts ; and finally changes expressions for their synonyms without alteration of thoughts. And yet, with all this affectation, these writings bear so distinct an impress of unassuming simplicity, that even their enemies recognize it. (4.) This hypothesis is especially refuted by the remark, that, let the order of the Evangelists be what it will, we are always forced to concede that, in many cases, the later Evangelist not only exchanges the clearer statement of his predecessor for a more defective and inaccurate one, but often apparently, though not actually, contradicts his authority, and that in a manner which must be intentional, since inaccuracy is insufficient to explain it.’

SECTION II.

THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS IN GENERAL.

The Christian originality of the Gospels is the decided factor by means of which both their unity and diversity, and the wonderful relation resulting from both, must be explained. But when we would explain this originality, we find ourselves almost induced, with respect to the relation of the Gospels to the actual Gospel history, to attribute to each a peculiar kind of origin. Besides, the conviction is pressed upon us, that each Evangelist has, in the appropriation of his matter, preserved his personal dignity, and by his manner of statement, impressed upon it his own peculiarity. Lastly, we find that each Gospel displays a special arrangement, arising from a peculiar plan, depending on special motives and considerations. Thus we obtain a triple impress of originality in the Gospels ; they are original in source, in composition, and in plan. It is no wonder, then, that they who have misconceived their peculiarity in all these respects, should have erred in a threefold manner.

The first factor in the composition of the Gospels, is the peculiarity of the sources whence their material was derived. These, in their full extent, include the following particulars : first, direct remembrance ; secondly, tradition ; thirdly, written memorabilia ; fourthly, already existing Gospels.

It is taking a defective view of the resources of an Evangelist, to set up the tradition-hypothesis alone, without duly estimating the great importance of the direct memory of the apostles. Especially must it be taken into account, as forming the basis of the first Gospel, viz., the original Hebrew Gospel, which was the immediate work of Matthew, and of the Gospel of John. It cannot be wholly, at least, denied to Luke ; and Mark is as near to it as he was, during his life, to the Apostle Peter, and to the apostolic church at Jerusalem. The powerful effect of the evangelical memory was, however, in each Evangelist, the very motive that induced the composition of a Gospel.

Direct remembrance was completed by tradition. The transition from one to the other is exemplified in those incidents, for the complete knowledge of which tradition was needed even by Matthew and John, the actual witnesses of the life of Jesus. Much which appertains to His history—the occurrences of His childhood, of His retirement, and of His private life—could only have been known to His disciples by communication. Not only their former, but even their present vocation, separated them occasionally from Him, so that the information of one would often need completion by the information of another. Thus fragments of memory and tradition formed various combinations, which gained unity from the fact that the memory of each individual disciple was continually excited by, and came in contact with, the general memory of the whole Church. Tradition then, intimately united indeed with apostolic remembrance,

appears to have been the actual source of those Evangelists who had had but little, or even no direct intervention in the facts of the Gospel history.

The freshness of this source was maintained by means of the continuous preaching of the Gospel ;¹ its purity and brightness, by the Spirit of the Gospel. The agency of this Spirit is of the highest importance in the origin of the Gospels. Without His assistance a disciple could hardly have written a Gospel. He was the remembrancer, not so much with regard to non-essential circumstances, as to the relative distinctness and significance of the several facts of the whole Gospel history. It is in the certainty wherewith He both explains and assumes the perfect actuality of the Gospel history, that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God. They who are unable to distinguish between the foreboding, myth-forming spirit, and the Holy Spirit hovering over the completed history, and assuming it as the scent does the full-blown flower, have not yet learned to distinguish between the beginning and the climax of the human race ; the historical development of tens of centuries is to them a blank. The Evangelists lived and breathed in the element of this reminding Spirit ;—could He then have left them so soon as they began to write Gospels ?² Hence it was under the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost that the Word of God solemnized also His literary incarnation.

The Gospel-forming tendency first manifested itself in the production of those lesser evangelical memoirs, which many who had enjoyed the privilege of intercourse with Jesus felt themselves impelled to write, in order to preserve any circumstance which seemed either specially remarkable, or which was at least the subject of direct memory. If it be asked, how such or such an apostle managed to keep this or that difficult discourse in his memory, such a question strikes at the questioner himself. If it be further asked, how these Galileans found time and skill to compile the facts of the Gospel history, the fundamental law is lost sight of, that it is a vital energy which sets quills in motion, whether in the bird or the man. Genius gave the pious Hans Sachs and the profound Jacob Böhm

¹ [‘Out of the countless multitude of Christ’s acts, those were gathered, in the ministry of twenty years, which were seen to have the fullest representative significance for the exhibition of His divine life. The oral collection thus formed became in every sense coincident with the “Gospel ;” and our Gospels are the permanent compendium of its contents.’—Westcott’s *Introd.* p. 155. There are few more interesting chapters in the history either of literature or of the Church, than that which treats of the connection of the Gospels with the apostolic preaching ; and a more adequate exhibition of it cannot be required than that which has been given by Davidson (vol. i. p. 405 ff.).—ED.]

² The older theology, by its doctrine of inspiration, misconceives the fact that the sacred writers were continually filled with the Spirit, and that their actions, whether of spiritual life or spiritual productivity, were free. The abstraction which would separate the inspiration of the Spirit from the inspiration of the life, is somewhat talmudistic. Modern theologians who oppose the doctrine of inspiration, seem to suppose that God’s messengers, to whom they concede the assistance of the Spirit in the general carrying out of their vocation in life, suddenly descended to the level of uncalled ordinary authors as soon as they took hold of the pen. According to the first notion, the Spirit forsook them if they did not write ; according to the second, if they did.

no rest; and that was the reason why these worthy shoemakers became such profuse authors. Undoubtedly, the art of writing itself originated in the impulse to preserve what was worthy of record, and not in accidental scribbling. Nay, man even learned to speak more by the urgency of the desire and necessity which he felt to express his thoughts, than by an experimental play upon his organs, or by the imitation of the lower animals. The remarks which have been made against the primitive records of the Old and New Testament revelation, upon the assumption that the art of authorship was not yet sufficiently understood in the world to account for the production of such memoirs, at such times and places, are expressions of the same lack of spiritual perception which asked concerning Jesus, How knoweth this man letters, having never learned? Never could the necessity of preserving glorious experiences by means of writing, have been more deeply felt than amidst the circle of Christ's witnesses. Nay, it may, without exaggeration, be maintained, that if the art of writing had not as yet existed in the world, it must have arisen among them. Those apostolic men were not more the men of their age, than they were the men, or the children, of the Spirit of Jesus.

Even the women who accompanied our Lord, may also have written from their own point of view, that, as priestesses of His Spirit, they might preserve in written records His precious memory. The Spirit of Christ poured out upon His disciples at the completion of His ministry, nay, proceeding from Him at all times, must indeed have often impelled those who were acquainted with His life, to commit to writing some of His sayings and deeds. It is not to be wondered at, that there were many, as St Luke assures us, who took such works in hand. Could the spring-tide of a new religion, nay, of a new humanity, the marriage feast of the reconciliation between heaven and earth, pass by without the guests and witnesses of this glorious life feeling constrained to preserve its most important circumstances in writing? At all events, a multitude of such memoirs did arise. These many lesser primitive Gospels, then, naturally formed the firm and fixed centre of evangelical memory and tradition within the circle of the apostolic Church. It is probable that a selection of such writings as St Luke had to deal with, was at the disposal of each of the Evangelists. These Gospel memoirs form the transition between tradition and those complete Gospels, into which the written announcement of the Gospel has settled. These Gospels arose one after another during a short period of time, and within a circumscribed sphere. Hence it may have been possible that one Evangelist was acquainted with the work of another, that the later might make use of the labours of the former. Mark might perhaps have known that of Luke, or at all events the Hebrew original of Matthew. According to tradition, John was acquainted with all the synoptical Gospels.

When we take into account the true communion of the Spirit in the apostolic Church, and the manner in which the life of Christ was

interwoven into its life, we can easily understand how, from all the various sources, a living unity of general tradition, a special manner of viewing and narrating the Gospel history, would be formed, in which all the apostles and Evangelists would have more or less resemblance to each other. The spirit of their faith, of their blessedness, of their worship, who made them all to be of one heart and of one soul, formed a mutual and most delicate *rappoart*, in which the very phraseology of the Gospel, the whole manner of its announcement, received a peculiar and singular stamp. This unity of view and statement, occasioned as it was by oneness of spirit, supreme simplicity, memory, mutual co-operation, and common written authorities, was the cause of that extraordinary unity which is perceived in the narratives and style of the Gospels, and especially of the synoptical Gospels.

This phenomenon is therefore caused by the marvellous agency of the Spirit of sacred Gospel remembrance in the primitive apostolic Church. Hence, they who look upon the precious fruit, which bears witness to the fulness of apostolic vitality, as the mere dead production of the poorest kind of compilation, are soon puzzled by the fact, that the originality of the several Evangelists everywhere animates this admirable unity, by touches of the richest variety. The critic would fain seize and handle this living unity as a mere dead uniformity; but when the rich play of Gospel individuality which forms its other side is perceived, his peace is at an end, and the terrible problem drives him like a restless spirit though the region of hypotheses.

It is part of the notion of Christianity, that by its sanctifying operations it should awaken and bring to perfection, on one hand, the whole unity of individualities; on the other, their entire variety. Hence the four Gospels contribute, even in their form, to the glorification of the Christian spirit, by exhibiting in large and plastic forms that vital congruity by which the Christian spirit is proved to be such. Hence the sacred originality of the Evangelists may be designated as the second factor of the Gospels, and of the peculiarity of their mutual relations. The authenticity of the four Gospels being assumed, it might fairly be expected that each should exhibit a definite and significant character. This is involved, first, in the notion of such evangelists as the Church could appropriate. Evangelists of such a kind could not but be prominent characters, and must consequently express themselves in a characteristic manner. But it is also involved in the notion of the mature primitive Christian, that he should exhibit his peculiarity in his work; for the spirit of Christianity, by means of its horror of annihilation, introduces individuality into a new life, and causes it to appear in the full glory of its definiteness. But if important characters appear in their full freedom, they will be distinguished from each other by strong peculiarity of feature. Thus the Gospels must be looked upon as the writings of distinct, important, and definite characters. It is by the exhibition of their originality that they manifest themselves to be the effects of such original forces. Hence each must of

necessity appear in its full peculiarity; and that criticism which would pass sentence upon them without a notion of this circumstance, must, for that very reason, be characterized as incapable or unchristian. But when it goes so far as to attribute the delicate manifestations of vital originality found in the Gospels to death, all that play of feature pertaining to living personality to the convulsive efforts of paralysed and half-dead individuals, such representations arise as those which make, *e.g.*, the ardent expressions of Mark, choice ‘printing’—the deeply significant and lyrically beautiful impulses of John, tedious prolixities. A true appreciation of the Gospels must be preceded by an appreciation of their writers. In this place, however, we can but state this principle, and must treat of the characteristics of the several Evangelists in another part of this work.

But, finally, when we remember that the great characters who wrote the Gospels attained their powers of Gospel authorship by means of definite and special occasions for their exercise in Christian interaction with various persons and circumstances, we have already admitted a third factor in the production and form of the Gospels. The character of the evangelist is neither an egotistical nor a vanishing one. It is on one side infinitely defined, and therefore, on the other, infinitely definable. Love makes him so pliable, that though ever building on the same foundation, he becomes all things to all men; that he preaches quite differently at Athens and at Corinth, for this very reason, that he everywhere preaches the same truth in its essential spirit, while adapting its form to the varying circumstances of his audience. If then we take this Christian principle into account, we cannot but view the peculiar form of each separate Gospel as resulting from the peculiar spiritual state of those for whom the Evangelist wrote. If due allowance is made for this factor, it will be perhaps better understood, *e.g.*, why the Gospel of John and Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians exhibit so much relationship. This reference of each Gospel to the circle for whom it was first destined, will explain the Old Testament references of Matthew, the sharply-defined pictures of Mark, intended as they were for the practical mind of the Roman, the catholic characteristics of Luke, and the ideal and theologic views of John. The Pauline Epistles show how variously the various necessities and receptive powers of the different churches could affect the one forcible and determined pen of a Paul. And thus must the various constellations in the kingdom of God have still more powerfully influenced the Evangelists, who, according to the law of liberty, of special vocation, and of love, devoted themselves each to special circles of readers. By the interaction of such situations with the characters of the several Evangelists, were formed, under the leading of the Divine Spirit, the plans of the several Gospels, whose immediate and intended destination was impressed not only on their fundamental characteristics, but also on their separate features; so that, even in this respect, each separate Gospel could not but receive a different physiognomy.

NOTE.

The Evangelist Luke has, in the introduction to his Gospel, pointed out the various stages of general Gospel tradition. (1.) Direct tradition, represented by the *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται*. (2.) The transition from memory to tradition. The *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται* are emphatically so called, and form, as it seems, as eye-witnesses from the beginning of the life of Christ, a contrast to those who were only *αὐτόπται*, &c., during a shorter period, and who seem denoted by the word *ἡμεῖς*. (3.) Tradition, in a narrower sense, pointed out by the words: *παρέδοσαν ήμῶν*. (4.) Memoirs; *πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατίξασθαι διήγησιν*, &c. The *ἐπεχείρησαν* seems to designate not so much the boldness of the attempt, or the insufficiency of the execution, as the first rudiments of Gospel composition.¹ (5.) The formation of the comprehensive Gospel: *ἔδοξε καὶ μοι*, &c.—Thus the first factor in the formation of a Gospel is stated in its full extent: the second and third are sufficiently indicated in the third and fourth verses.

SECTION III.

ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS IN PARTICULAR.

The various factors which operated in the production of the Gospels, took various forms, exerted various degrees of power, and consequently produced various kinds of interaction in the life of each separate Evangelist. Hence the sum of their effects could not but be different in each particular case. The total sum of effects is formed by the motive, the plan, of each Gospel, and by the germ which gives to each its own special form of development.

The simplest motive was the cause of the Gospel of Mark. We here behold an Evangelist who deals rather in vivid and copious representation than in profound doctrines and views, seizing with the ardour and animation of youth upon the Gospel tradition, and depicting in lively traits the ministerial life of Christ. But the tradition of the Gospel history which guided him, had already taken, through the statements and views of Peter, a special form exactly corresponding to his requirements; for the style of this versatile Evangelist's narrative is, from the very first, determined by the lively views of this ardent and congenial, but stronger apostle, who, equally with himself, displays a preference for the concrete. Besides, this Evangelist was urged to write his Gospel by Romans, and indeed by single members of the Roman Church. The Roman Church, as such, must have expected from him a statement of the

¹ [Westcott (p. 173 of his *Introd.*) acutely remarks, 'He finds no fault with the basis on which the earlier writers rested. His own determination is placed on an equal footing with theirs (*ἔδοξε καὶ μοι*).']—ED.]

facts of the life of Jesus ; but the wish of individuals, as such, would impel him more especially to a presentation of his matter in pictorial scenes ; and the result would be just such a Gospel as we have in the second. Mark narrates events in his own manner ; his ardent and lively imagination is everywhere manifested in his Gospel. He derived his information from the apostolic discourses of Peter, which dispensed with the chronological connection of events for the sake of blending them with doctrinal announcements. Hence a strict historical sequence is wanting in this Gospel.¹ His narrative was written for a circle of Roman Christians ; hence he confined himself so much to the concrete, and made use of many Latin words and phrases. From the circumstance that his inducement to write arose from a private circle, the double conclusion of his Gospel may be in some measure explained. His communications, that is to say, were gradually formed : how naturally, then, might a cessation take place towards the close, and a subsequent completion be added, after the dissemination of the former communications ! Criticism, in its oscillations between opposite extremes, has at one time too highly estimated, at another too much depreciated, this Evangelist and his Gospel in comparison with the other Gospels. Even Augustine caused this Gospel to be misconceived, by regarding Mark as ‘the follower and abridger’ (*pedissequus et breviator*) of Matthew.² Euthymius Zigabenus pronounces a similar opinion.³ In modern times Michaelis has remarked, that ‘Mark wrote with Matthew’s Gospel in his hand ;’ and afterwards, that Luke also made use of it. Hereupon Griesbach sought to prove⁴ that ‘the whole Gospel of Mark, with the exception of a few verses, is derived from Matthew and Luke.’ Saunier, in his work *über die Quellen des Evangeliums des Markus*, 1825, Theile zur Biographie Jesu, p. 34, Strauss in the *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 78, and others, have embraced this opinion. Even Ammon agrees on the whole with this view of the Gospels.

Erroneous notions of the second Gospel were first attacked in a doctrinal point of view by Mill and Wolf. When a contradiction was felt to exist between the doctrine of inspiration and the assumption that Mark was a mere ‘follower’ of Matthew, such a persuasion involved the true notion, that an Evangelist, as such, was too truly invested with the dignity of a definite, an inspired, and an apostolic life, too powerfully impelled to work in the strength and blessing of

¹ Even Credner, in his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 123, shares Schleiermacher’s view : that the description given of the presbyter John by Papias, according to which Mark did not write τάξει, does not suit our Evangelist. He remarks that this Gospel preserves the same order as Matthew and Luke, and that they therefore who would nevertheless refer the expression of ‘John the presbyter’ to Mark, do at the same time impugn the chronology of Matthew and Luke. At all events, the chronology of Matthew and Luke is corrected by the Gospel of John.

² *De consensu evang.* i. 2.

³ Comp. Ammon, *die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, p. 69.

⁴ *Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthæi et Luce commentariis decerp- tum esse demonstratur* (*Opusc. acad.* vol. ii.)

his own special spiritual gift, to exhibit the mere lifeless performance of a compiler or copyist. It was subsequently owned, that the Gospel of Mark could not be wholly accounted for by that of Matthew, but that it assumed a more comprehensive evangelical tradition. Koppe especially embraced this view. The recognition of the peculiarity of this Gospel was gradually prepared for, as may be remarked in Schott's *Isagogē, &c.*, p. 90. Nay, Mark was indemnified for the misconception he had experienced, by this view being surpassed, and his Gospel made the basis of those of Matthew and Luke, which has been done in our days by both Wilke¹ and Weisse,² after the precedent of Herder and Storr. Finally, credit for the greatest things has been given to this Evangelist, by attributing to him the *Apocalypse* also.³

That the originality of Mark makes him independent of Matthew and Luke, may be seen from his omissions, not to mention the characteristic vividness of delineation pervading his whole work. On the other hand, however, the originality of the second Gospel can derogate nothing from that of the first and third, which not only surpass Mark in extent, *i.e.*, in reporting certain circumstances which he has omitted, but also in the more significant and profound sequence and tone of their communications.

Nothing material can be urged against the tradition of the fathers, according to which Mark composed his Gospel at Rome, about the time of Peter's martyrdom. The variety of their statements may perhaps be accounted for by the various editions of this Gospel. According to Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius, Mark composed his Gospel during the life of Peter; hence the edition which Eusebius followed was one wherein the conclusion, chap. xvi. 9–20, was wanting. Irenæus makes the Evangelist write after the death of Peter; consequently he used a later edition, which included the conclusion.

While Mark sketched vivid pictures from the Gospel history from a Petrine point of view for Roman Christians, Matthew undertook the task of composing a Gospel for Hebrew Christians. His disposition and official vocation equally impelled him to such a work. He could not but lead his fellow-believers in the Old and New Testaments to the heights of the theocratic standpoint, and show them the fulfilment (*the πλήρωσις*) of the Old Testament in the New. Hence his Gospel is, as to matter, filled with references to the Old Testament; as to form, with Hebraisms. Hence he is constrained to represent the Messiah in the great acts of His historical manifestation, and so to arrange them as to make them act, as far as possible, in their totality as credentials of His dignity. Hence so prominent a position is occupied in the beginning of this Gospel by

¹ *Der Urevangelist, oder exeg. krit. Untersuchung über das Verwandtschaftsverhältniss der drei ersten Evangelien*, Dresden und Leipzig, 1838.

² *Die evang. Geschichte*, vol. i.

³ Hitzig, *Über Johannes Markus und seine Schriften, oder: welcher Johannes hat die Offenbarung verfasst*, Zurich, 1843.

the genealogy, and at its close by the announcement of the destruction of Jerusalem. In striking contrast, however, to that genuine Israelitism, the line of Messianic life appearing in the person and institution of Christ, must that false tradition of Israelite nature, viz., Pharisaism, be exhibited. This foundation of the Gospel of Matthew was from the first so firmly laid, that its Greek compiler could alter nothing essential, without intentionally destroying the execution of this significant design.¹

The birth-place of this Gospel must at all events have been Palestine. The date of its origin is probably that when, by reason of the storm then gathering over Jerusalem, the Christians began, according to their Master's injunctions, to leave the Jewish commonwealth, sunk as it was in delusion, and to emigrate chiefly to Pella.²

Luke wrote his Gospel under the influence of his Pauline tendencies. Hence he stood in direct opposition, not only to inimical Judaism, but also to morbid judaized Christianity. This stand-point gave him a special sense for all those incidents in the Gospel history, in which the calling of the whole Gentile world into the kingdom of God appears. Hence a stronger feature of catholicity pervades his Gospel. It also satisfactorily proves that the supposed discoveries, according to which this Gospel contains Ebionite views needing to be expunged, are entire failures. Luke wrote the history of the divine Friend, the Shepherd, the Saviour, of the human race. In carrying out this task, a number of written notices of the life of Jesus were at his disposal. Some of these pieces he allowed to produce their full effect, by incorporating them in his work without materially altering them. But he could not feel himself bound, in the task of editing such documents as had come to his knowledge, to follow exactly the succession of events in the Gospel history from its commencement, as he certainly might have done, partly by the help of tradition, and partly perhaps by that of his own memory (*παρακολουθεῖν ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς*, chap. i. 3).³ His peculiarity has imparted its tinge to his whole Gospel, though we cannot but feel how differently he would have written, if he had not been guided by the distinct impress of Gospel tradition.⁴ He wrote his Gospel, first, for Theophilus, a Christian of some consideration, who at the same time represents, in his view, a class of Christians who, both by education and the solicitude they evinced on the subject, had a better right than many others to require such a history of Christ's life as, being founded upon accurate information, might afford them certainty (*ίνα ἐπιγνῷς τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*). When, then, Luke promises Theophilus that he would write the Gospel history in order, κα-

¹ Comp. Credner, *Einleitung*, pp. 62, 63.

² According to Irenæus, *adv. Hæres.* 3, 11, Matthew wrote his Gospel while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel in Rome. This remark points to the same period.

³ Compare Schleiermacher : *Ueber die Schriften Lukas*, Berlin, 1817. With great penetration and delicate perception, has Schleiermacher pointed out the primitive basis of this Gospel, though he certainly makes the Evangelist play too much the part of a mere compiler.

⁴ See Credner, 132.

θεξῆς, we are led to expect that he meant thereby the accurately ascertained chronological sequence. But when we view the actual state of the case, and remark that he observes this historical sequence only in general, and not in his delineation of Christ's ministry; that, on the contrary, he brings prominently forward another kind of order, namely, that of Christ's continual journeyings; we cannot but suppose that this was the order which he intended from the first. Other writers of Gospels had already attempted to set forth in order (*ἀντάξασθαι*) the Gospel history, according to certain principles of arrangement: this, however, was to be his principle, to communicate to Theophilus the Gospel history, in a previously determined order, of which the journeys of Christ should form the leading idea.¹

The date of this Gospel is probably an early one: perhaps about that of St Paul's first imprisonment at Rome. At all events, it is antecedent to that of the Acts of the Apostles. There must, however, always be a difficulty in supposing that Luke discontinued this latter book at a place where he might have carried it on much further, namely, at the time when Paul had lived two years at Rome.

The Evangelist John had, according to a tradition which there is no reasonable ground for doubting, the synoptical Gospels before him, when he composed his own. Hence he did not concern himself with directly communicating such parts of the Gospel history as were already known. But the history of the life of Jesus had, through the operation of the recalling Spirit, become to his profound and delicate mind, more than to any other apostle, the history of the Incarnate Logos, the centre of the ideal world. That centre of civilization² in which it was his lot to represent the Church of Christ, induced him to form his confession of Christ into an ideal Christology. He was, however, impelled to this full development of his views by the twofold manner in which the worldly spirit, which had entered the Church, had deformed Christian doctrine; hence its mature form resulted from its contest with the first begin-

¹ Compare, on the introduction to Luke's Gospel, Gfrörer, *die h. Sage*, Pt. i. p. 33.

² The Church tradition according to which the Apostle John exercised the office of bishop and ended his life at Ephesus, in Asia Minor, has been opposed, as being without foundation, by Lützelberger, in his essay *Die kirchliche Tradition, &c.* This tradition is, however, independently of its own value, accredited by Irenæus (*Contra Her.* iii. 3), and still more decidedly by certain ancient writings, in which the Asiatic churches of the second century, in their contentions with the Romish Church concerning Easter, appeal to the authority of the Apostle John. These are, chiefly, the letter of Polykrates, Bishop of Ephesus, to Victor, Bishop of Rome (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* v. 24), and the letter of Irenæus to Victor, according to which Polycarp also appeals to the Apostle John, in opposition to the Romish Bishop Anicetus. What then has Lützelberger to oppose to this? Schwegler (*Theol. Jahrbücher von Zeller*, No. 2, p. 289) points out as his most important arguments: (1.) An explanation of Gal. ii. 6, according to which, it is said to follow from ὅποιοι ποτε ἤσαν, that John was already dead when the Epistle to the Galatians was written. (2.) The hypothesis, that by the ‘disciple whom Jesus loved,’ spoken of in the fourth Gospel, we are to understand, not John, but Andrew. Schwegler speedily and completely confutes both these assertions. It is being over scrupulous to suppose, that allowing John to have been Bishop of Ephesus is equivalent to admitting that he failed to execute his missionary vocation; for the mission of the apostles was not only to be diffusive over the earth’s surface, but concentrated in its important places.

nings of Ebionitism and Gnosticism. The Evangelist had consequently the opportunity of forming his Christology with special reference to the inimical contrasts which it had to encounter in the world. Hence arose that fundamental idea of his Gospel, which has already been stated. If the synoptical Evangelists had spared him the task of narrating Gospel facts, they had, on the other hand, prepared another task for him, by their neglect of chronological sequence in their several delineations of the Gospel history. In this respect, therefore, John was induced not only to give it decided prominence in his Gospel, but also to depict more copiously the commencement of Christ's ministry, which his predecessors had but slightly touched on. It was peculiar to his mind to view the general in the prominence of the particular. Hence the more important incidents of the Gospel history, in which, on the one hand, the reception which the light of the world experienced from 'His own,' and, on the other, the repulse by which 'the darkness' excluded itself therefrom, were most decidedly expressed and carried out, occupied the foreground in this view. This ideal Christology, the ideal and real life of Christ represented, with reference to both the friendly and inimical treatment it met with in the world, in an orderly succession of its most striking incidents, formed the plan of his Gospel. John could not have arrived in Ephesus before he had reached an advanced age. Here, however, he found himself within the influence of just such inducements, whether arising from favourable or opposing circumstances, as were calculated to mature within his mind the form of his Gospel.

NOTE.

According to the conclusions at which criticism has as yet arrived, the Evangelists appear before us as figures which, like mysterious spirits, freely and easily pass through its attacks, because critics are entangled in endless and often mortal contests with each other. Thus, at one time, it is said that the author of Matthew's Gospel not only frequently copied from Mark, and was thus externally dependent upon him, but also frequently misunderstood him, as being wholly unacquainted with the Hebrew manner of thought and expression (comp. Hitzig, *Ueber Johannes Markus*, p. 47); that he has irrevocably forfeited the credit of an eye-witness (Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 309); nay, that his Gospel, in its present form, is no apostolical testimony at all (Credner, *Einleitung*, p. 95).

Then, again, the collection of sayings by the Apostle Matthew, said to form the basis of the first Gospel, is declared to be, with respect to the authenticity, trustworthiness, and genuineness of its communications, in every way equal to the communications of Mark (Weisse, *d. evang. Gesch.* vol. ii. p. 1); and these sayings are said to have been copied with almost verbal accuracy (*Id. vol. i. p. 109*). Again, this Gospel, it is asserted, exhibits very plainly the characteristics of its Jewish origin (Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 4). At one time Matthew is looked upon as the author of the Gospel, but the Gospel is considered a fiction (see Bauer, *Krit. der evang. Gesch.*);

at another, the Gospel is credible, and even derived as a translation from the primitive Aramaean Gospel, but has been ascribed, without valid historical ground, to Matthew (see Ammon, *die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, vol. i. p. 61); nay, this Gospel, independently of its pretensions to the authority of an apostle and eye-witness, is placed before those of Mark and Luke (Theile, *zur Biographie Jesu*, p. 35). Now Mark appears as a compiler, making a selection from Matthew and Luke (Theile, *zur Biog. Jesu*, p. 34; Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 78), and only a few verses are allowed to be original (Griesbachii, *Opusc.* vol. ii.). Then, again, Mark is the founder of the whole family of synoptical Gospels (Wilke, Weisse, &c.) His statements are said to be reproduced, after being levelled and flattened, in the other Gospels; his views are independent, his chronological arrangement his own (Hitzig, as above, p. 46). Not only are the synoptical Gospels founded upon his, but the Apocalypse is also his work. With respect to Luke, at one time, there is not sufficient ground for attributing to him the Gospel bearing his name. A doubt is even cast upon the testimony that it was the production of a companion of St Paul. In any case, the companion of St Paul may have composed his work among accumulations of tradition, from which no apostolic influence protected him (Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 80). Too much honour is done to the author of this work, when the attempt is made to bring any of his statements into harmony with chronology (*Id.* p. 265). In the case of Luke, historical accuracy is, seriously speaking, entirely out of the question (Weisse, vol. i. p. 90). At another time this same Evangelist is represented as a Christian investigator, whose credit is not diminished but increased by referring his work to the earlier works of original and gifted eye-witnesses of the events (Schleiermacher, *Ueber die Schriften des Lukas*, xvi.) Again, we cannot mistake the more cultivated Hellenist in him. The tradition, that he committed to writing the Gospel preached by Paul, is strikingly corroborated by comparing certain passages in Paul's Epistles with parallel passages in this Gospel, especially the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper (Gieseler, *Historisch-kritischer Versuch*, p. 124). Finally, the Apostle John is, by a critical bias, gradually removed from the list of Evangelists. According to B. Bauer, the unnamed disciple, who has been supposed to be this apostle, is only a phantom formed by the fourth Evangelist (*Kritik*, iii. 340). According to Lützelberger, the Gospel itself is infected with crude dualistic assumptions, and is therefore of Manichæan tendency (*Die kirchl. Trad.* p. 286). According to Größer, on the contrary (*Das Heiligtum und die Wahrheit*, p. 346), the work of the fourth Evangelist is not only genuine, but he has performed his task 'as well as could have been expected.' According to Credner, only an inhabitant of Palestine, an immediate eye-witness and an apostle, only the beloved disciple of the Lord Jesus, only that very John whom Jesus had bound to Himself by the heavenly charm of His teaching, could have been the author of such a Gospel (*Einleitung*, p. 208).

PART VII.

THE RELATION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS TO THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECTION I.

AN ATTEMPT TO EXHIBIT THE GOSPEL HISTORY IN ITS UNITY.

THE Gospel history has ever presented itself, in its essential features, to the eye of Christian faith as a unity. Faith has ever found the Gospel in the Gospels. It is one of the marks of matured believers, that Christ has been formed in them. They have an enlightened spiritual perception of His nature and history. Their knowledge must, from its very nature, be ever increasing in clearness and fulness. But it has not come to perfection until all the essential contents of the Gospel history, as found in the four Gospels, have their place in the harmonious image resulting from this one perception of the life of Christ. And faith is striving after the same end as theological science, when the latter is seeking to exhibit that unity from the four Gospels.

But both in the assumption on which this effort is founded, and in the process whereby it is to be realized, science may depart from the point of view occupied by faith. At all events, science must differ from faith at every step of this effort in this respect, that while faith is rejoicing in the spiritual unity she has found in the life of Christ, science is endeavouring to exhibit this unity in the fulness of those historical features displayed in the Gospels. Consequently, while faith has ever rejoiced in the unity of Christ as experienced at its centre, the high aim of science has ever been, and still is, to exhibit its whole circumference.

This effort of science cannot but be regarded as the expression of a noble and essential impulse of the mind. The mind everywhere seeks unity, whether in history or nature; it cannot but seek it, because its own nature is the free unity of varieties. Variety, indeed, cannot oppress it, so long as it can either perceive or anticipate therein the fulness of unity. But if variety seems to obstruct unity by its mysterious nature, or to obliterate it by obvious contradictions, the mind becomes uneasy and excited, and finally seeks it at any cost. The moral and religious capacity for discovering unity

in variety is indeed very various. The Monotheist, *e.g.*, finds in the infinite variety of the world the bright and certain manifestation of one Spirit; the Polytheist finds therein the confused separateness of countless gods. The former finds unity because he goes to the cause; the latter loses it because he is prejudiced by the outward effect. So also will a strong, healthy, evangelical mind see the unity of the Gospel in all the Gospels; while a mind fixed upon outward matters of detail and of the letter, fancies it discovers a complication of contradictions.

Even in their assumption concerning the relation of the four Gospels to the one Gospel history, the decisions of science and faith are often widely different. Christian faith cannot but regard it as an advantage to possess the Gospel in this four-fold form and development; science, on the contrary, is almost accustomed to see in this circumstance a deficiency, an injury. The former would not part with one of the Gospels, because each serves more clearly to display the infinite riches of Christ in a special aspect; science, on the contrary, seems often inclined to give up all four, for the first best scientific representation of the life of Christ, or even for a negative criticism of the evangelical narratives.¹

This difference is still more strikingly displayed in the respective methods of procedure of these two mental tendencies. While faith finds the same Christ and the same presiding Spirit of Christ in each separate occurrence of the Gospel narratives, and even looks upon discrepancies in details as corroborations of the truth and freedom of this spirit, the scientific impulse, which is more or less alien to faith, desires the perfect external unity, or even uniformity, of the evangelical narratives. This impulse, in its Christian form, produces that positive harmony which regards the external accordance of the Gospels as a condition of their internal agreement, or indeed confounds the two, and makes faith dependent upon the fact of the Gospels exhibiting the lawyer-like exactness of a statute-book. In its non-Christian form, however, this same impulse produces negative harmony, which finds not only in actual discrepancies of detail between the several Gospels, but even in every mere appearance of discrepancy that can be raked up, signs of their legendary nature. Both kinds of harmony suffer from the same lack of feeling for the vividness with which mind is wont to express itself, and terminate in a complete talmudistic minute criticism with respect to the externals of the Gospels, corresponding with their utter misconception of their inner life. These two forms of harmony stand in the same polar relation to each other as Popery and Separatism, or as despotism and anarchy. The one annihilates the peculiarity of the Gospels, to exhibit more forcibly the uniformity of the Gospel; the other, on the contrary, denies the powerful unity of spirit manifest in every feature of the separate Gospels, and sees in them an endless complication of apocryphal mental

¹ ['M. Renan a voulu, comme il le dit, nous faire lire un cinquième évangile, extrait des quatre autres.'—Pressensé, *L'Ecole Critique et Jésus Christ*, p. 14.—ED.]

activity, living particles capriciously jumbled together from every quarter.

It is the problem of faith ever more and more to introduce the separate features of the Gospel narratives, viewed in their mutual harmonious relations, into the Church's contemplation of the life of Jesus, viewed as a whole. It is the problem of theological science, on the contrary, ever more and more to strive, by successive approximations, to exhibit from the materials at hand the perfect unity of the life of Jesus. When the tasks of both are completed, both must meet at the same place. But, meanwhile, faith cannot exact of science that she should hurry her task, or even, with lawyer-like partiality, solve her problem at any cost, as though she were concerned to save the life of a threatened client. Such an exaction was indeed long ago made by little faith, till science, which she had enslaved, breaking through her bonds, thenceforth conducted the cause of the Gospels in an opposite direction, with the vindictive spirit of a fugitive slave. When, however, science would, on her part, enforce upon faith results which assume and involve another view of the world than the Christian one, she must in this form appear to faith under the same aspect as Jewish or Mohammedan arguments would, when dealing in an antichristian manner with the Gospels. Such science no longer stands in polar relationship to faith, but has nothing to do with it. Christian science starts from the assumption of the central unity of the four Gospels. She seeks to follow this vital unity of spirit into the very veins of their several details. Having, however, to deal with the analysis of four great individualities in their respective performances, and in their relation to the Gospel history, her task seems an endless one. But it is not only the subject itself which makes this task a difficult one. In estimating it, we must also take into account the imperfect state of science, both as being still in process of development, and limited by human weakness. Hence her several decisions are arrived at without the confidence of full assurance. Nothing could more retard her progress than to convert her conclusions or views into settled maxims. The more cautiously she proceeds, the more assurance may she express, because she proceeds upon the certainty of a firm foundation, and has the certainty of a real end in view. It is in this sense that our attempt to give a single delineation of the Gospel history is to be made. With regard to the extent of this representation, it will, for the sake of obtaining a comprehensive view of the whole subject, go beyond the limits of the four Gospels, *e.g.*, with regard to a description of the secular circumstances among which the life of Jesus was passed. With regard to its execution, however, this representation will consist only of a sketch of the subject, since the full consideration of the matter will be given in the development of the four separate Gospels.

SECTION II.

THE GOSPEL HISTORY, IN THE ORGANIC FOURFOLD DEVELOPMENT
OF ITS FULNESS.

The life of the world arises from a fundamental principle, and propagates itself in an infinite variety of forces, forms, and aspects. Proceeding from variety, and seeking this fundamental principle, man appears in his ideality as the centre of life, the idea of the world, according to which all other forms are regulated. When we would contemplate the highest forms of animal life, the last steps of the pedestal on which that life which forms creation's statue is exalted, these appear to be the ox, the sacrificial animal, the type of suffering and bleeding life ; the lion, the type of ruling, royally free life ; the eagle, the type of sacred, contemplative life, soaring above the earth. Above these three heights of animal life, man appears as the image of spiritual life, reproducing all these grades in a higher unity (Rev. iv. 7). Man is the suffering being, who goes through all the woe of the world to its very depths, formed for submission to his fate, the child of sacred sorrow, the ox, the sacrificial animal, $\mu\acute{o}\sigma\chi\acute{o}s$, like the $\tau\rho\acute{a}\gamma\acute{o}s$ or scape-goat, which tragedy symbolically denotes. Man is the royal being, who judicially rules the world, and perpetrates the slaughter of his victims with fierce or joyful enthusiasm. Man is finally the eagle of spiritual enlightenment, flying towards the sun, and viewing all things in the light of the spirit,—the eagle of a contemplation which soars far beyond empiricism. But when man answers to his destiny, and is equal to himself, he is all these at once : he is the tragic sacrificial animal, the contending and victorious lion, the contemplative eagle, loving to abide in the light ; he is all in one, and it is in this unity that he is man.

These typical forms of animal life, together with their spiritual unity, man, form the deep-meaning theocratic symbol described in the vision of the prophet Ezekiel (chap. i.), and also in the Apocalypse (chap. iv.) In the symbol of the cherubim above the ark of the covenant, the Israelite beheld the glory of God as reflected in the fulness of the world, the unity of life as it branches out into diversity of form. All that lives belongs to the spirit, is forfeited and sacrificed thereto : this is denoted by the ox. All that lives, enjoys, struggles, conquers, because it represents spirit ; this is expressed by the lion. All that lives, loves to float in visionary intoxication in the sunlight ; this is the form of life represented by the eagle. But all that lives, reaches its climax in man ; the spiritualization of suffering, of action, of contemplation, form in him a unity ; and from this unity arises the fourth typical form of life, humanity.¹

¹ Compare Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, vol. i. p. 360. Though the ox 'was to all nations the emblem of procreative and active power,' yet it might well have another signification in the theocratic realm. Moreover each animal was here a moral symbol. [See Fairbairn's *Typology*, i. 222 (3d ed.), and George Smith's *Doctrine of the Cherubim*.—ED.]

We have seen in the preceding part of this work that Christ is the perfect, the glorified man, the God-man. As then man in general spreads abroad his fulness in the world, so does the God-man in the Gospel, the instrument of the world's enlightenment. And as the fulness of man, as man, ramifies in the world, so does the fulness of Christ ramify itself in the Gospels. Irenæus displayed a happy fertility of presentiment, when he found in the peculiarity of the four Gospels, a reference to the four living creatures in Ezekiel.

The assumption that one single man, in one single work, would have furnished a better delineation of the life of Jesus than four different chosen Evangelists, who complete each other and form one united whole, is equivalent to the view that the personality of Christ might, in its depth and extent, be repeated in other persons, though in weaker forms. But how could He then, as the one Head, stand in true organic unity with His various members? The unity of life spreads abroad its infinite fulness in the four typical forms of life. So is it also with the unity of the life of Christ. It was determined in the counsel of God, and provided for by the Spirit of God, that the life of Christ should be viewed by great but different, separate but concurrent, apostolic characters, and that it should in the same manner be committed to writing by four Evangelists.¹

Hence we cannot scientifically know the life of Jesus in all its fulness, nor learn the extent of the effect it produced, unless we are intimately acquainted with it, as represented in the four Evangelists. But even in this case we shall only seek and find the Gospel in its fulness, when, on the one hand, we find in the four Gospels the true unity of the Gospel history, and, on the other, learn to appreciate and understand each expression of the Gospel, in the series of the four Evangelists, in its own definite peculiarity.

Each Evangelist had his special province and gift of grace, by means of which he was to apprehend and represent the Gospel.² And that each was faithful to his appointed task, is evident from the accordance between the characters of the Evangelists as we become acquainted with them from the Gospel history, and the peculiarities of those Gospels which they severally composed. As, for instance, St Mark's Gospel is, with respect to its general character, rightly called 'The Gospel'; so also is it, with respect to its peculiarity, rightly called 'St Mark's.' This accordance between the Gospels and the known characters of the Evangelists to whom they are ascribed, is at the same time a very important testimony to their authenticity. We are not, however, now regarding this accordance with respect to the authenticity of the Gospels, but as opening our eyes to the fact, that to each Evangelist was given a special and peculiar view of the glory of Christ.³

¹ Compare Olshausen, *Commentary on the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 4.

² Compare the work of F. Sander, *Etwas über den eigenthümlichen Plan dem die vier Evangelisten bei der Abfassung ihrer Evangelien gefolgt sind. Essen bei Bädeker*, 1827; Ebrard, *Gospel History*, p. 66 ff.

³ Comp. my article on the authenticity of the four Gospels, *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1839, i. 7.

Matthew, the apostle of Christ, who is several times included in the apostolic catalogue, and for the last time in Acts i. 13, was formerly a receiver of customs by the Lake of Gennesareth. According to the united testimony of the synoptical Gospels (Matt. ix. 9, &c.; Mark ii. 13, &c.; Luke v. 27, &c.), he was called by Jesus from the receipt of custom to the apostolate. Though the disciple thus called is named Levi by both Mark and Luke, yet there is not the slightest doubt that they intend the same person whom the first Gospel designates Matthew. As a receiver of custom, Matthew must have possessed a certain amount of social education; especially it may be presumed, that he had gained a facility in writing, and was accustomed to the practice of this art. Both the administration of public business and the financial management of private business necessitate systematic arrangement. The public official is obliged to arrange and methodize his business, and consequently to use titles, rules, and indices. Hence Matthew was accustomed to systematize.¹ And it was consistent with such a habit, that in his written delineation of events, he should be accurate in his statements of the essential, and neglect the graphic and the reflective.

As a publican, Matthew was at variance with the pharisaic party, and the pharisaic disposition among his own people. The dictum of the orthodox Jew designated him as unclean. He must have shared the contempt in which his fellow-publicans were held, and had undoubtedly often experienced it on special occasions. Such constant misconception and neglect with regard to religion, could only be regarded with indifference, through frivolous carelessness, or a more liberal piety and more vital comprehension of the Old Testament. It must have been in the latter respect that Matthew had become free from the power of Pharisaism. Otherwise Jesus, even though He had stopped him in his wild career, brought him to salvation, and won him for His kingdom, would hardly have placed him so early among the Twelve. We conclude then that he was a pious Israelite, prepared for the acknowledgment of Christ by an intimate acquaintance with the Old Testament, and that, being at the same time one of those who were of a freer turn of mind than their contemporaries, he had a feeling of the difference between the law of the Lord and the traditions of the fathers. And if we entertain the reasonable view, that Jesus admitted among the Twelve only those more important and prominent characters in whom natural qualifications for a great work already existed, we must assume, in the case of Matthew also, an important personality.

But the fact of his conversion from a publican into an apostle of the Lord, in whom he recognized the true eternal King of Israel, must have been idelibly impressed upon his mind as a miracle of divine grace. He was despised in the eyes of the false theocrats of

¹ It has been remarked, that it is questionable whether publicans who farmed the public taxes actually kept accounts, after the practice of modern tax-gatherers. But this is not the question. The impulse to arrange and classify, arises from the necessity of order, and this arises from any official employment.

Israel, and the true Theocrat thus highly exalted him. He must have learned to feel the contrast between the true and the spurious kingdom of God in all their respective aspects. But even without taking into account the unreasonable contempt of the Pharisees, his former doubtful calling, when compared with his present exalted vocation; his former associates, who consisted partly of the most degraded of men, when contrasted with the consecrated circle in which he now lived; and finally, his former, when compared with his present state of mind; must all have appeared to him in their darkest colours. He was translated from a condition of the deepest shame to one of the highest honour—from a most critical to a most advantageous position. Hence it would accord with such a state of things, that a strong feeling for contrasts should have been formed in him.

Thus Matthew comes before us as a pious and unprejudiced, a resolute and educated, a seriously-minded and important Israelite. The true historical connection of Christianity with pure Old Testament Judaism, as well as the contrast between it and Judaic Pharisaism, are expressed in the fact that this Israelite publican was destined to write his Gospel first of all for Jewish Christians.

The peculiarity of this Evangelist is decidedly expressed in his Gospel. First, with regard to formal peculiarities, it is remarkable that the first Gospel should be the work of that very apostle who was practised in the art of writing.¹ But it is a characteristic of this Gospel, which is increasingly recognized, that a careful grouping of events prevails throughout. The observation of this circumstance, namely, that arrangement is so very apparent in the discourses in chap. v.—vii., chap. x., chap. xiii., chap. xxiv. and xxv., induced, by an over-hasty process of association, the hypothesis that the original Gospel of Matthew consisted only of a collection of sayings. It may, however, be easily proved, that even those parts of this Gospel in which facts are narrated, are arranged according to the motives which evoked them. Thus, *e.g.*, the first manifestation of the Messianic miraculous power of Christ, is exhibited from the beginning of the eighth to the end of the ninth chaps.; and thus also are those great conflicts between Christ and His age, which preceded His persecution, depicted in chap. xi. and xii. These hints may suffice to direct attention to the true architectural fitting in of parts, exhibited by the whole Gospel; the carrying out of this remark must be reserved for our subsequent development of this Gospel. With the tendency of this Evangelist to group his events, is closely connected the feeling which led him to exhibit in juxtaposition things which presented sharp contrasts. We have already remarked upon this style in our Evangelist. Thus, *e.g.*, in what striking antithesis do we find Herod and the new-born King of the Jews, and the teaching of Christ and the teaching of the Pharisees

¹ Thus Mark was predisposed to write a Gospel by his ardent spirit of enterprise; Luke, by his education and habits of investigation; John, by that contemplative bias, which in his case far outweighed the external circumstances of life.

in the Sermon on the Mount ! The whole Gospel, in fact, is full of contrasts. It is also peculiar to it to exhibit objects only in their bold outlines and characteristic features. When objects are to be portrayed in all their sublimity, it would but exert a disturbing influence to enrich them at the same time with graphic details. In such a case, the delineation of particulars must necessarily be kept under. The reason why Matthew did not descend into particulars, is explained by the fact, that it was the simple grandeur of the Gospel facts which filled his view.

His peculiarities of form, however, are but the expression of peculiarity of matter. He exhibits the Gospel in its historical relation, as the completion, the spiritual fruit of the christological growth in the Old Testament. It was his task to prove to his own nation that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham (chap. i. 1). But just because Christ was, in his eyes, the true and spiritual King of the Jews, and His kingdom the true theocratic kingdom of God, did Matthew from the very first give prominence to the great contrast between the spiritual Israel and the worldly and hardened Israel. Thence it was, that from the beginning new conflicts were ever arising, thence that we continually meet with fresh sufferings of the holy Heir of the ancient theocracy till His death upon the cross, new triumphs till the manifestation of His glory. The series of the Messiah's sufferings runs through the whole of this Gospel as its prevailing thought. Even in that overture to the whole, the genealogy, we detect the notes of this tragic theme ; for Mary is represented as misunderstood by her betrothed, and in danger of being exposed, together with her child, to civil dishonour ; the child is persecuted by the secular power, and doomed to death, while the prelude of His death is seen in the slaughter of the infants of Bethlehem. The preference of this Evangelist for exhibiting Christ in His theocratic sufferings, is manifested in several characteristic traits. Nevertheless he also delights in everywhere displaying His triumphs. How characteristic is it, that it is Matthew who, in the history of Peter's wounding the high priest's servant, records the words of Jesus : ' Thinkest thou, that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He shall presently give Me more than twelve legions of angels ? ' Thus it is Matthew who, in recording this incident, is concerned for the dignity of the King ; it is Mark who is careful for the character of his friend Peter, and omits the reproof ; while Luke, the physician, is occupied with the case of the wounded man, and narrates the healing of his ear. It is also in accordance with this view of Christ, that Matthew, at the close of his Gospel, represents Him as the glorified Prince of heaven, to whom all power in heaven and earth is delivered.

It is clear, then, that we possess, in the Gospel of Matthew, a delineation of the life of Jesus, which presents it in all the distinctness and fulness of a peculiar view. This Evangelist makes our Lord known to us in all the certainty and depth of His relation to history. We

here learn to estimate the relations of Christianity to Judaism, and to general historical traditions in the world. We even become acquainted with the double nature of these traditions, as they represent both the outpouring of the curse, and the outpouring of the blessing. Nowhere else is that golden thread which connects all history, the ever advancing though secret progress of mankind, so clearly displayed; and nowhere does the Eternal appear so pure and bright in history, so free from all contamination of the corrupt and perishable, nay, in sharpest and sublimest contrast to all the pretensions of mere dead statutes. Modern philosophy has not always been able to separate the laws of Jehovah from the decrees of the fathers in Israel. At one time, Christ is said to have been crucified according to the Mosaic law; at another, not to have felt bound to observe the Mosaic law in His own conduct. Philosophers might, in this respect at least, learn from Matthew that egg-shell dance of the thoughts, the distinction between laws and customs, since Matthew has drawn a portrait, in which the ever correct and quickest motion of a holy life between the most exact observance of law and the freest non-observance of customs is depicted. In this respect Christ is, according to Matthew's delineation, in an ideal sense the historic Christ; while, according to John, He is in an historic sense the ideal Christ. From this Gospel we may learn to estimate parchments according to their value, the historic veins of the blessing of christological reference, and especially the indestructible thread running through the depths of the world's history. Here we become acquainted with the idea of the symphony and its accomplishment, with the prophetic relation between buds and blossoms on the tree of the world's history, between preludes and concluding chords in the history of Israel. But here also we discern the true freedom and glory of that ideal and consecrated life, matured on the tree of history, contrasted with the poor, naked, illegal appearance it presented to those who were prejudiced by the rusted and decayed traditions of history. None other displays, in features so speaking and forcible as Matthew, the nothingness of ungodly temporal or hierarchical power, in its enmity against a Christ sharing the poor man's lot. The manner in which he exhibits the suffering Son of David submitting to the sentence of death, amidst the misconception and delusion of His own nation, sheds, from that bright centre where the true sin-offering of the human race bleeds to death, a light upon all the tragic events and tragic poems of the world, in their christological and presentient allusions. He teaches us to receive Christ in the hungry, the thirsty, the strangers, the sick, the naked, the prisoners. But above this holy suffering, we here behold in all its glory the overruling providence of the retributing and assisting God. The kingdom of the Father's glory surrounds the scene of the historical reality; it beams around, and breaks in at the decisive moment. The harmony between the tender centre of the world, the holy child, and the ardent circumference of the world, the all-ruling

providence of God ; between that freest life, Christianity, and the eternal appointment, the counsel of God ; between the triumph of the kingdom of Christ, and the rule of the Almighty Father ; is here depicted in the clearest characters. Hence, this Gospel may be defined as that which casts a light upon the suffering Christ, and in Him on Christian suffering, and all the christological sufferings of the world, especially upon the tragic course of history, by special views and definite representations.

As Matthew sets forth the Redeemer in His relation to history, so does Mark exhibit Him in the reality of His power as the Son of God (chap. i. 1) ; as He, reposing on the fulness of His Godhead power, manifests His life in an increasingly great, striking, and fervent agency, and spreads blessings around Him, the Lion of the tribe of Judah.

The special ray of Christ's glory which John Mark's peculiarity fitted him to exhibit in vivid touches from the fulness of Gospel truth, was the manner in which His deeds revealed the greatness of His person. According to Acts xii. 12, he was the son of a Christian woman named Mary, in whose house at Jerusalem the believers, or at least the principal among them, were wont to assemble. When Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles, he was already known and esteemed by the Christian Church, or Luke would not have introduced his mother to notice by naming her son. He was a Christian, and early devoted himself to the apostolic missionary life ; on which account Paul and Barnabas took him with them on their return from Jerusalem to Antioch (Acts xii. 25). Thence he accompanied them, as their helper and minister, on their joint missionary journey (Acts xiii. 5). He travelled with them to Seleucia and Cyprus, and thence to Asia Minor. When they arrived, however, at Perga in Pamphylia, he parted from them and returned to Jerusalem (Acts xiii. 13), while they continued their journey to Pisidia. When they were about to repeat this journey from Antioch, for the purpose of strengthening the churches they had founded, John Mark was again there. Barnabas even proposed that he should again accompany them. 'But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work.' A strife now arose between them, and they separated from each other. Barnabas, taking Mark with him, sailed to Cyprus ; and Paul, choosing Silas for his companion, passed through Syria and Cilicia (Acts xv. 37, &c.) This John Mark is undoubtedly the same whom we subsequently find again with Paul during the imprisonment of that apostle at Rome ; whence it arises that he is introduced to us as one well known to the Christian Church of that time, and as nephew to Barnabas. Paul wrote concerning him, in his Epistle to the Colossians (chap. iv. 10) : 'Aristarchus, my fellow-prisoner, saluteth you, and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabas (touching whom ye received commandments : if he come unto you, receive him).' In his second Epistle to Timothy, he says (chap. iv. 11), 'Take Mark and bring him with thee : for he is profitable

to me for the ministry.' In the Epistle to Philemon, Paul mentions him among his fellow-workers, and sends greetings from him (ver. 24). And the same Mark, at another time, sends greeting by Peter to the churches at home, from Babylon. 'The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth Marcus my son:' 1 Pet. v. 13. The Mark who could be thus so plainly designated as the friend and acquaintance of the Christians of Asia Minor or Palestine, and who besides stood on so intimate a footing with Peter, that that apostle could call him his son, could have been none other than the same frequently-mentioned John Mark. Sufficient notice of him has thus been handed down to us, even if we do not introduce the tradition, according to which he suffered martyrdom as Bishop of Alexandria.

The incident related by Mark himself, in his account of our Lord's Passion, of a young man who followed Jesus when He was arrested, and then escaped from the young men who laid hold on him, has frequently been regarded as a circumstance which the Evangelist relates concerning himself. It has indeed been said, that this is a merely groundless supposition. But without taking into account the fact, that the Apostle John also introduces himself into his Gospel without name, and in the same manner as Mark does the young man, we can scarcely fail to recognize in this small episode of the Passion, the identical John Mark of the Acts and Epistles. At the entrance of the troop into the city with their prisoner, when all the disciples had fled, 'there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body' (Mark xiv. 15). This was undoubtedly a young man whom Mark had some reason for leaving unnamed; whom the excitement caused that night by the announcement that Jesus had been taken prisoner, had aroused and driven from his couch; and who already stood in a friendly relation to Him,—a young man who is soon ready, who casts a garment about him and hastens out; who is precipitate in action. This same youth, however, who is so prompt in exposing himself to danger, is just as prompt in flying from it, and again shows himself precipitate and full of anxious hurry: 'And the young men laid hold on him; and he left the linen cloth and fled from them naked.' We have here, as it were, a psychological prelude to the first missionary journey of John Mark. He was ready to start, prepared for the journey: his ardent desire for missionary work had early brought him into the society of Paul. All went on well as long as they were sailing on the blue waters of the Mediterranean, as long as they stayed in the safe and polished land of Cyprus, and even while they sojourned on the coasts of Asia Minor. But when at length the mountain land of Asia Minor had to be traversed, he gave way—certainly for no reason which Paul could think sufficient—and returned, not to Antioch, but to his home at Jerusalem. Afterwards, however, he was again at Antioch, his fervid mind urging him back to the forsaken path. Barnabas was willing to take him again, and, as Olshausen justly remarks, know-

ing the good disposition of his beloved kinsman, he espoused his cause. Paul, however, rejected him, on account of his want of reflection, and still hesitating and unreliable enthusiasm. And therefore he again traversed with Barnabas the old and more convenient missionary route. But the Spirit of God was leading him, and he progressively and decidedly advanced from the paths of enthusiasm to those paths of Christian self-denial, upon which he at last laid down his life in the cause of his beloved Master. It is a precious testimony to his growth in humility and earnest faith, as well as to the apostolic benevolence of St Paul,^{*} that he was afterwards so closely connected with that apostle, and stood by him during his imprisonment in Rome. But though his individuality was thus progressively purified and sanctified, he could not but continue like himself in all its essential qualities ; and hence we always meet with the same old ardour, more wont to kindle into a sudden blaze, than to burn steadily on. Now he is far westward with Paul at Rome, then far eastward with Peter in the region of Babylon. If we add to this the testimony of history, he is finally at Alexandria, and thus dwelt and did the work of an Evangelist in the great capitals of the three quarters of the world. We see in him an apostolic man who maintained a truly earnest faith in an easily excited mind, who was undoubtedly endowed with a powerful imagination and a high degree of enthusiasm ; but whom a certain want of profundity of mind, and quiet strength of character, disposed to an external display of enthusiasm which perhaps rendered the strict consistency of Paul too powerful for him, and inclined him to the more congenial companionship of Peter. At all events, the above-mentioned features are clearly discernible in his transitions from one to another of the great missionary stations and renowned apostles.

All the characteristic features of this fervid and enthusiastic Evangelist appear in his work. With respect to the negative side of his character, we recognize a man who is quick, not too persevering, and indisposed to deep contemplation. His Gospel is short ; it terminates abruptly ; it exhibits no distinct basis of arrangement or division ; it communicates but few of Christ's discourses, and those but briefly, and chiefly such as are of the most fervid kind,—disputes, reproofs, and His sayings concerning the last judgment. It is also elliptical in expression ; e.g., where the disciples are forbidden to put on two coats (chap. vi. 9) ; or where the Roman centurion concludes, from the cry of Jesus at his death : This was the Son of God (chap. xv. 39).

The lively vigour of this Evangelist is, however, displayed in a rich abundance of positive energy, and it is with this that we are now concerned. The constant excitement and enthusiasm of his view is expressed in the strength of his expressions ; e.g., in the accumulation of negatives, *οὐκέτι οὐδείς*, as well as in his choice of unusual words, modes of expression, and constructions. It appears also in the rapid succession of his pictures ; the word 'straightway'

(εὐθέως) is his watchword. Vigour of this kind generally ramifies into the gifts of a vigorous and graphic imagination, a strong pre-dilection for the concrete, and a consequently happy memory for details, connected with an excitable temperament, with its affectionate mode of expression. Hence it is Mark, with his graphic imagination, who tells us that Jesus was *with the wild beasts* in the wilderness; that the accursed fig-tree was *dried up from the roots*. Such finishing touches are entirely in keeping with truth; they are the fruit of independent and closer observation. This Evangelist also manifests his sense for objective detail, when he relates how Jesus, in His passage across the lake, was *in the hinder part of the ship, asleep upon a pillow*; when he remembers that the blind beggar at Jericho was called Bartimaeus, the son of Timaeus; and relates the beautiful parable (chap. iv. 26, &c.) in so striking a manner, or recalls the gradual process in the cure of the blind man (chap. viii. 22). His frequent use of diminutives specially testifies to his affectionate manner of expression (e.g., θυγάτριον, v. 23; παιδίον, v. 39; κοράσιον, v. 41; κυνάρια, vii. 27; ἵχθύδια, viii. 7). It is in accordance with this same ardent cordiality, that we find in this Gospel frequent transitions to foreign expressions, especially a number of Latin words (δηνάριον, κεντυρίων, &c.).¹ The second Gospel, then, is that of an enthusiastic view, a portraiture of the Son of God in His glorious fulfilment of His office, in the greatness of His operations. The history of Christ is made to pass before us in a rapid succession of great pictures, drawn from the life. He fulfils His beneficent mission in great working days, with sublime effort, and amidst great press of work; a constant storm of forces proceeds from Him. Hence He is also ever encompassed by crowds, especially of the needy, so that often He has neither room to stand nor time to eat; nay, His laborious love at one time kindles into such ardent activity, and produces such an excitement among the surrounding multitudes, that His friends wish to withdraw Him from the crowd, uttering those words of anxiety: ‘He is beside Himself’ (chap. iii. 21). He makes the deepest impression upon the people; they wonder, they are beyond measure astonished, they are amazed, when He appears, and manifests His love and power. And His acts were in accordance with such an influence, ‘for He had healed many; insomuch that they pressed upon Him for to touch Him, as many as had plagues.’ Wherever His arrival was heard of, they brought unto Him all that were sick in the neighbourhood, and exposed them on their litters in the streets, with the request that they might touch but the hem of His garment; ‘and as many as touched Him were made whole.’ Even the mere appearance of Christ struck the multitude, so that they trembled with reverence

¹ On the peculiarities of Mark, compare Credner, *Einleitung*, 102; Hitzig, *Ueber J. Markus u. s. Schriften*, 119; Ebrard, *Gospel History*, 78. [Davidson (i. 152) follows Credner's arrangement, and exhibits in detail Mark's peculiarities both of diction and style. Westcott also (p. 344) gives an independent account of the same, though he has ‘derived great help from Credner.’—ED.]

and joy (chap. ix. 15). His acts are also a continual victory over inimical powers. This Gospel is far less pervaded than the first by anticipations of death. Of the sayings of Jesus on the cross, Mark has preserved only the exclamation : ‘ My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me ? ’ Just the lion-like cry of sorrow. In the same manner, he relates the history of the resurrection chiefly in its most agitating effects.¹ The disciples, in their sorrow, will believe no announcement of His resurrection : neither that of Mary Magdalene, nor of the two disciples who had seen Him in the way. As soon, however, as Christ appears among them, and reproves their unbelief, their disposition is entirely changed : they are now in a condition to receive the commission to preach the Gospel to every creature. An influx of Christ’s power accompanies His messengers, and confirms their words, after His resurrection and ascension. Thus does Mark conclude his Gospel in complete conformity with his own view ; for it was in those miraculous healing influences of the power of the Son of God, which agitate and change the world, that the life of Christ had been contemplated by him. And in this view he is unique ; the Gospel which he announces, is the Gospel of those vital powers of Christ which pervade the world. He is ever representing Christ as an ever-active, divine-human energy. The manner in which He moved the minds of the people to every pitch of emotion, to horror, fear, trust, hope, delight, rapture, and poured forth His reproofing, healing, and sanctifying power upon these different frames of mind, must be learnt from Mark. The celerity with which Christ accomplished a work so infinitely great ; the enthusiastically arduous daily labour by which He filled the world with the power of His name ; the ardent and persevering courage with which He burst through the sorrows of the world, and through the grave, and raised Himself to the throne of His glory ; are portrayed in this specifically distinct conception of His life as characteristics of the Divine Hero, carrying out His work of salvation in swift and conquering operations. This mighty activity is at the same time a symbol, representing all vigorous, divine works, all the agitating, awakening, animating ministrations of hearts filled with God, all the victories of christological deeds, every lion-like effort, every lion-like roar, every lion-like victory of faith on earth, and in general every ray of victorious power proceeding from the throne of the Son of God.

In the first Gospel we behold the Redeemer, as the promised Son of David, entering upon His kingdom by the path of suffering ; in the second He appears before us, as the infinitely powerful Son of God, obtaining a victory over the world amid floods and storms of conquering power, and therefore in the way of divine and rejoicing activity. But we have yet to know Him as seeing and seeking in the Israelites the whole human race ; and, though limited as to His earthly surroundings by the Israelitish nation, as delivering and blessing the world. The Evangelist Luke was called upon both to

¹ Ver. 14 of chap. xvi. so entirely coincides with ver. 8, that the genuineness of the concluding passage might be inferred therefrom. All is entirely in the spirit of Mark.

comprehend and exhibit the Gospel history on that side which reflected the divine Son of man.

The first notice of Luke in the New Testament appears in his second work, the Acts of the Apostles, which informs us in the most unassuming manner, that at Troas he first shared in the Apostle Paul's missionary journey (Acts xvi. 10 and 11). 'Loosing from Troas, we came with a straight course to Samothracia,'¹ are the words in which he communicates the fact of his entrance into the apostle's company. We then lose him again from the society of Paul and Silas at Philippi (Acts xvi. 17, &c.), where the two latter were cast into prison on account of the cure by Paul of a young woman who was a soothsayer. When they were afterwards liberated, and departed thence, Luke remained, as it appears, at Philippi. When Paul returned to Philippi, Luke again joined him, and sailed with him from Philippi to Troas on their way to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 6). In Jerusalem also we find them together; Luke going with Paul into the assembly of the apostles (Acts xxi. 18). He was, however, once more separated from him by the arrest of Paul, which was effected by the Jewish Zealots (Acts xxi. 27). After Paul had been sent to Cæsarea, and while he was detained there in milder but tedious imprisonment, Luke seems to have been again in connection with him. For it is said, that the governor Felix 'commanded a centurion to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and that he should forbid none of his acquaintance to minister or come unto him' (Acts xxiv. 23). At least the command, in consequence of which Paul travelled to Italy, was also a decision concerning him, and for him. 'It was determined that we should sail into Italy,' says he (Acts xxvii. 1). He consequently accompanied Paul on this voyage, and came with him to Rome (Acts xxviii. 14). At Rome Luke was, at least for some length of time, the helper of the apostle. It was hence that Paul wrote in his second Epistle to Timothy, 'Only Luke is with me'; and in his Epistle to Philemon, and in that to the Colossians, also written from this city, Luke is included among those who send greetings. It is from the latter Epistle that we learn that Luke was a physician, and that he was beloved by the apostle: 'Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas greet you' (Col. iv. 14); and also that he was a Gentile, since, after it is said (chap. iv. 10 and 11), 'Aristarchus, my fellow-prisoner, saluteth you, and Marcus, &c., and Jesus which is called Justus, *who are of the circumcision*', there follow the names of others, who are therefore not of the circumcision, and it is among the latter that the name of Luke is found.

If we now turn to the account of Epiphanius, that Luke was one of the seventy disciples, and to the information of Theophylact, that he was designated by some as one of the seventy disciples, and, in-

¹ That both in this passage and chap. xx. it is not Timothy who is the narrator, as some have supposed, is evident, as has been rightly remarked, from a comparison of vers. 4, 5, and 6 of chap. xx. Comp. Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit der ev. Gesch.* p. 136.

deed as the one who, with Cleopas, met with the risen Saviour, these traditional accounts, considered alone, may be purely hypothetical. This is, however, the place to state what may be said in favour of the hypothesis. And, first, we may remark, that Luke alone relates the account of the journey to Emmaus, and that in a very graphic manner; making the presumption that he was himself an eye-witness of what he narrates a very probable one. It is especially striking, that he should leave the name of one of these disciples unmentioned; and when this practice is compared with that of John, this circumstance seems to point to the fact, that the author was speaking of himself. If this were the case, we should then have to conclude that Luke, as a Hellenist, introduced to the Messiah through those who revered him (perhaps one of the Greeks mentioned, John xii. 20), had come with joyful hope to keep the feast at Jerusalem, and had been most deeply agitated by the unexpected turn which matters had now taken. Such a conclusion would explain the expressions, ‘Art thou the only stranger in Jerusalem who hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days?’ (chap. xxiv. 18); and, ‘we trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel,’ ver. 21. Besides, it is only on this supposition that the expressions *πέρι τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων*, and *οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου* (chap. i. 1, 2), are perfectly clear. Luke thereby declares that he had not been present at the earlier events of the Gospel history, though he had at the later—they had taken place while he already belonged to the sacred circle (‘among us’). He also had then become an eye-witness and minister of the Gospel, but this did not suffice to make him a narrator of the whole Gospel; for such a purpose he must also avail himself of the communications of those who had from the beginning (*ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* emphatic by position, expressing the contrast) occupied such a position. Finally, the before-mentioned expression of Papias should be well considered in connection with these circumstances. He had a witness who, together with John, the apostolic presbyter, represented that oral tradition which he places in contradistinction to the writings of Matthew and Mark. When he reduces his Latin name Lukanus, Lucilius, or Luke, to its probably earlier form Aristion, this entirely corresponds with his palaeological feeling, as does also the circumstance that he calls the apostles, presbyters.² (Comp. p. 138 and 148).

Luke was then a Hellenist. The whole history of his life requires us to attribute to him a certain proportion of the Hellenistic edu-

¹ On the meaning of the word *πληροφορέσθαι*, comp. Gfrörer, *Die h. Sage*, p. 39.

² Where *πληροφορέσθαι* has the signification of “to be certainly convinced,” it is used *medialiter*; the subject to which the verb then relates, is always a person, an intelligent being, never a thing. Applied to things, its first meaning is “to complete, to make whole;” compare the use of the word, 2 Tim. iv. 5.’

² It may be justly asked, Why Aristion, a man honoured by Papias as a disciple of the Lord, and named by him in connection with John the presbyter, was not known and celebrated in the apostolic Church? This difficulty can only be obviated by the supposition, that Aristion was known to the Church by the name of Luke.

cation of his age. He was a physician, living in a seaport town. In such a position, although the calling and position of physicians are not to be judged of according to present circumstances, it was necessary that he should satisfy the requirements of the time with respect to a higher degree of cultivation, nor could he fail to experience the intellectual influences and excitements of the age. If, as Eusebius informs us, he was born at Antioch in Syria, he must have been influenced, even in his native city, by the secular learning of his age. In any case, as a Hellenistic Monotheist and proselyte, he had certainly attained that degree of cultivation in which reflection on spiritual relations is called into existence. In his medical career, this reflection would soon develop itself into an investigation of physical, anthropological, and psychological relations. It must also be granted that, in the case of Luke, the force of an important personality was added to these endowments. Even if his connection with Theophilus, who, as we infer from the preface to St Luke's Gospel, was a man of some importance, is not taken into account, yet his constant association with Paul is well calculated to place his personality in the most favourable light. Perhaps it was owing to the respectability of his position and appearance that the politic and interested magistracy of Philippi left him unassailed, when Paul and Silas were thrown into prison, and that he was also left at liberty at Jerusalem, when Paul was arrested there. If Luke had, in these cases, failed in fidelity, that apostle would scarcely have again accepted him as his companion, nor would he have been subsequently found among the followers of a man so constantly threatened. If he were a man who acted rashly and inconsiderately, how did it happen that he suffered so much less than the apostle whom he accompanied, that his career is entirely lost sight of beside the more persecuted one of St Paul? The Acts of the Apostles displays his talent for research and delineation.¹ Endowed with these gifts, firm, yet submissive and gentle, cultivated and acquainted with the world, he became an assistant of the apostles. We will not insist that he passed some part of his life in intercourse with the Lord. At all events, as an inquiring Greek who, passing through the middle territory of Jewish Monotheism, was seeking the knowledge of salvation, he attained to faith in the Gospel in another manner than the pious Israelites. It was not so much the fulfilment of the Old Testament types and prophecies, as the fulfilment of his own yearnings after the manifestation of the Godhead in flesh, and especially of his anticipations of the fairest of the children of men, the actual ideal Man, the true Physician and Friend of humanity, which made him recognize in Christ the Saviour of the nations. The moral nature of Christianity, its holy humanity, the fulness and universality of its love for man, must have made the deepest impression upon a Hellenistic believer like

¹ On the learned acquaintance of Luke with the events of his times, comp. Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte*, pp. 136 ff., and Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, p. 254.

Luke. But when he subsequently lived in intercourse with Paul, this recognition of a universalism in Christianity, which looks upon all men alike, would grow to a recognition of the grace which, within the sphere of this universalism, turns first of all to those whom the world contemns, that it may restore the balance of eternal righteousness, which hath ‘chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise ; and the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty ; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are’ (1 Cor. 1. 27, 28).

Thus endowed and prepared, Luke was called upon to write the third Gospel. It is *his* view of the Gospel history. We find his whole self in his work. With respect to its form, it is evident, particularly from its chronological inaccuracies, that he was not personally present at all the events of Christ’s life, especially the earlier ones. We recognize his habit of research in the manner in which he supports his statements by a collection of trustworthy memoirs, often letting these speak in their own words, as shown by the frequent concluding formulae with which his work is interspersed,¹ and by the variety of diction employed. Especially does the pure Greek in which the introduction is written, when contrasted with the Hebraistic style of the Gospel, together with its research into Gospel history, testify to the fact that Luke, as an Evangelist, adopted the very language of the evangelical traditions. Schleiermacher, in his above-mentioned work, not only designates Luke a good collector and arranger, but specially praises him for having *almost exclusively accepted genuine and good passages* (p. 302). ‘This,’ says he, ‘is certainly not the work of accident, but the result of an investigation undertaken for a definite purpose, and of well-considered choice.’ Luke’s acute spirit of inquiry did not, however, merely collect an excellent selection of Gospel incidents peculiar to himself, but also many most valuable notices, which either complete, explain, or even correct the narratives of the other Evangelists. It is he alone who gives the reasons for the birth of Jesus at Jerusalem, the history of John the Baptist, the appearance of Moses and Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration (chap. ix. 31), the instruction of the disciples in the Lord’s prayer, the circumstance that Peter was armed with a sword at Gethsemane (chap. xxii. 38), and many other circumstances and occurrences in the Gospel narrative. His statements are in many respects more accurate than those of Matthew and Mark. He clearly distinguishes, for instance, in the prophecy of Christ concerning the last things, between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world. According to him, the saying of Christ concerning the heavenly signs runs thus: There

¹ Such concluding forms are found by Schleiermacher, chap. i. 80, ii. 18, 40, 52, chap. iv. 15, 44. In some, the assumption, which sees concluding forms in generalities of the kind adduced, may deceive ; they should nevertheless be duly estimated in the sense in which this critic explains them, as a characteristic trait pervading this whole Gospel.

shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; according to Matthew and Mark, The stars will fall from heaven. It is he who has preserved the fact of the great difference between the impenitent and the penitent thief, and informed us of the happy end of the latter; while Matthew summarily relates the blasphemy of those who were crucified with Jesus. He says of the disciples, with a psychological appreciation of their state of mind, *They believed not for joy* (chap. xxiv. 41); while Mark represents them as upbraided by the Lord for their hardness of heart, which nevertheless is equally correct, since they were not yet fully sanctified (Mark xvi. 14). The reflections with which the Gospel of Luke is interspersed, display also the superior education of its composer. Among these may be reckoned, e.g., the remarks on the miraculous agency of Christ: 'The power of the Lord was present to heal them,' 'there went virtue out of Him, and healed them all' (chap. v. 17 and vi. 19); also the account of the occasion of the transfiguration: *And as He prayed, the fashion of His countenance was altered.* Many allusions in this Gospel seem, either by their insertion or position, to manifest the inclination of its author to psychological reflections. Did he perhaps intend to point out, even in the holy and blessed frame of the mother of Jesus, her fitness for bringing forth the holy Son of man? If this question is left undecided, it is certain that he has inserted in the narrative he gives concerning Jesus at his twelfth year, a reflection on the wondrous development of His mind. 'Jesus,' says he, 'increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.' It seems also not the result of accident, that in the passage chap. ix. 54-62, the religious and moral phenomena presented by four different temperaments are placed in juxtaposition, while it is shown how Christ dealt with and healed each; viz., the angry zeal of the sons of thunder, the sanguine enthusiasm of a believing scribe, the melancholy home-sickness of a mourner, and the phlegmatic delay of a sluggish disciple. This juxtaposition is peculiar to Luke. The important notice of the disposition of the disciples, after Jesus had announced to them His approaching sufferings, is given by Luke alone, and that with such extraordinary emphasis, as must either be attributed to the most thoughtful reflection, or the most thoughtless tautology. It is said, viz., chap. xviii. 34, '*They understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken.*' Perhaps this might be briefly summed up in the words, they *would not* and *could not* understand; that is, first, they would not take it to heart; therefore, secondly, the whole thing remained an enigma to them; and hence, thirdly, what was simple was incomprehensible. Undoubtedly Luke, accustomed as he was to act on motives, lays so strong a foundation, because he had afterwards to build upon it the strange phenomenon, that they did not believe the resurrection though it had been previously announced to them. In the remark also made by Luke, after relating how Pilate sent his prisoner to

Herod for judgment, that the same day Herod and Pilate were made friends, may be discerned, as it seems to us, a psychological reflection, and even the refined irony of a Christian acquaintance with human nature. The preservation, too, of that glorious account of how the Lord turned and looked upon Peter after his third denial, testifies to the same psychological acuteness for the wonders of the Light of the World. These various traces of the psychologist in this Gospel, naturally lead us upon those of the physician. To discover then the physician in this work, we need by no means go so far as to seek for technical medical terms. We have already pointed out some of the most striking marks of this kind. All the four Evangelists, for instance, relate the rashness with which Peter cut off the ear of the high priest's servant. Matthew, Mark, and John, however, seem, in the press of this mysterious moment, to forget this slight inconvenience. Jesus, the Saviour, however, though in so terrible a situation, could not leave the wound of the sufferer uncared for ; and a report of His interposition being extant, Luke, the physician, could not pass it by, as the others had done. The physician could not but manifest himself in a characteristic report, and he does it in the words : 'Jesus touched his ear and healed him.' It is likewise Luke alone who tells us of the sweat which fell, 'as it were great drops of blood,' from Jesus in Gethsemane.

When we contemplate the mental peculiarity which meets us in Luke's Gospel, it is evident that it is its manifestations of divine pity and mercy which form in his view the key-note of the Gospel history. Even his sense for what was humane and rational in argument points to this; *e.g.*, in chap. xiii. 15, &c. : 'Doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering ? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath-day ?' Christ everywhere appears to this Evangelist in the aspect of the benevolent Redeemer, tenderly sympathizing with the sorrows of men, and consoling them with the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth. Very characteristically does he prolong His genealogy beyond Abraham to Adam ; His descent is from man. The first of His discourses communicated in this Gospel is that to His poor countrymen at Nazareth, and is founded on a consolatory passage in the Old Testament (Luke iv. 17). How tenderly does He address to the widow of Nain the unspeakably touching words, Weep not ! while He himself weeps over Jerusalem, looks back with melancholy sympathy upon the daughters of Jerusalem who were following Him on His way to death, and prays for His enemies while hanging in agony on the cross. This same spirit of Divine pity is expressed also in the relation of His Gospel to man, as exhibited in a concentrated form in the view taken of it by this Evangelist. The solitary and childless priestly pair are first visited, and highly favoured, and then, in the highest degree, the poor virgin of Nazareth. The Holy Child is born into the world ; but poor

shepherds are the first to rejoice at this event, which brightens the last days of the aged Simeon and the solitary Anna. It was through a miraculous benefit that Simon Peter was astonished and first made entirely Christ's disciple. We soon after find Jesus in the presence of the anxious centurion of Capernaum; even the elders of the Jews intercede for him. How remarkable is the selection of a resurrection narrative in Luke: it concerns the only son of a widow! This kind of selection goes through the whole Gospel. Even the appearance of holy women among the followers of Jesus, was a circumstance which would catch the eye of this benevolent Evangelist. It was quite in Luke's nature to preserve Mary's hymn of praise, in which the Lord is extolled as 'He who putteth down the mighty from their seats, and exalteth them of low degree; who filleth the hungry with good things, and sendeth the rich empty away.' And if Luke, in his version of the Sermon on the Mount, pronounces the blessedness of the poor, the hungry, the mourner, as such, though with special notice, in the case of the hated, that it is for the Son of man's sake that they have incurred this hatred (vi. 22), this is so far from being a mark of that Jewish Ebionitism which declared the poor Jews to be blessed above the rich Gentiles, that it seems, on the contrary, impossible to misunderstand here a direct contrast to that Ebionitism, if there be but capacity to receive the notion that the Gospel does, in fact, seek out its subjects first of all among the oppressed and afflicted. This applies also to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. But it is no weak and cowardly pity, which abandons the fallen, that is exhibited in this Gospel, but the divinely strong pity of eternal mercy. Luke alone relates the pardon of the 'woman which was a sinner,' the conversion of Zaccheus, and the penitence of the crucified thief; he alone has given us the parables of the lost sheep and the lost piece of money, and that most glorious of all parables, the prodigal son. The contrast between the spirit of Christ and the spirit of Pharisaism, is expressed with the strongest emphasis by this Evangelist. The history of the ten lepers, among whom there was but one grateful, and he a Samaritan—the narrative of the good Samaritan—and the parable of the Pharisee and publican, taken together, express this contrast with most inculpating effect. Luke's Gospel is to its very close characteristic, for the Saviour departs from His disciples while He is blessing them.

The world and the Church needed this chosen instrument to collect and preserve the brightest, loveliest rays of Christ's glory, to sound abroad the most peculiar tone of His divinely humane heart, the tenderest and mightiest notes of His tender mercy. Of all the cherubic symbols, it is the image of the man which is the most applicable to Luke. In his Gospel it is declared that the grace of God cares for, nay, is poured forth upon the poor, the lowly, the mean, the overlooked, the despised, the forsaken in the world. Compassion appears in all its freeness, nay, in all its loving, joyful pride, in opposition to the prejudices of Pharisaism, of fanaticism, of ecclesiasticism stiffened into heart-

lessness, and of absolute pietism relying on its privileges. This grace appears also in its more general form, as love; and in its genial nature as rejoicing, tender loving-kindness, under a thousand aspects. It is incarnated, however, in the Son of man, as holy, glorious humanity, of one nature and agency with Him, manifesting itself through Him, His most peculiar honour. Through Him it is related with all christological life in the world. Whatever of love and kindness passes from heart to heart, every exhibition of faithfulness, help, or good-will, offered in the spirit of true benevolence or pity, proclaims the breathing of that gentle, divine-human spirit, whose fulness flows forth from Christ upon the world. This christological trait is the more precious to the Lord, the more it is outwardly obscured by hereditary heterodoxy, heathen tradition, and similar ancient husks of the old offence. The good Samaritan is one after His own heart, who died on Golgotha under the ban of excommunication, and upon that terrible scene of shame and desolation effected the salvation of the world. Thus does the third Gospel exhibit, together with the abundance and power of the grace and human love of Christ, a world of kindred emotions and influences, proceeding from and returning to Him.

If, then, we regard the Gospel history as the climax and centre of all life, and then remember that all life proceeds from the Spirit, and is, in its deepest foundations, entirely ideal; it is at the same time evident that the relation of the Gospel history to the ideal must be made clear. Since we find, then, that the three first Gospels, notwithstanding the richness of their contents, do not in a specific and definite manner satisfy this necessity, it is evident that we need a fourth Gospel to complete the announcements of the former, by an exhibition of the relation between the Gospel history and the idea.

Both in Christ Himself and in His life, this tone of ideality, the lyric and recognized reference of His life to all that is ideal in the world, could not but resound in fullest purity. This is involved in the firmly established notion of His personality; and isolated expressions of this reference are found even in the synoptists. But are we to conclude that Christ could find no instrument capable of the most definite apprehension of this sacred basis, this deepest and sublimest side of His whole manifestation? Are we to suppose that the most refined, the deepest, the sublimest view of His life, is the production of some idealistic apocryphal author, not included within the apostolic circle? In this case Christ would not have fully manifested Himself, or rather, he who had thus imperfectly manifested himself could not be the perfect Christ. No idealist, with his surplus of philosophical refinement, was needed to supply what was lacking to Him. And what idealist of the Platonic or Philonic school could have done this?¹ The idealistic reasoner of the second

¹ In the Gospel of John, and in his First Epistle, the spirituality of all creative life is expressed in so pregnant a manner, that the opposers of the authenticity of the Gospel may be confidently challenged to point out whence the light of this knowledge could have originated, except from the breast of Jesus, by means of a most germane and elect instrument.

century is placed too high, when the production of St John's Gospel is ascribed to him. The ideal Son of man is placed too low, when the consciousness of His relation to the ideal, and the revelation of this consciousness by means of an appropriate and elect instrument, is denied to Him.

It was the Apostle John who was called to the apprehension of this tranquil ideal depth of the life of Jesus. An inspired enthusiastic thirsting after light seems to have been the chief feature of his character. He was the son of Zebedee, a Galilean fisherman on the Lake of Gennesaret, and brother of James the Great. His father seems to have willingly devoted his worldly superfluity to higher purposes (Mark xv. 40, 41); his mother Salome was a pious, courageous, aspiring woman (Matt. xx. 20). It was probably from her that John inherited his noble mental tendencies. We early find him among the disciples of the Baptist, and he was undoubtedly one of the first disciples of Jesus (John i. 35 comp. Matt. iv. 21, &c.) John, together with his brother James, and Peter, were gradually admitted into a peculiarly intimate relation with the Lord (Matt. xvi. 17). These three disciples were the very elect of the elect.¹ We sometimes see him associated with Peter, especially in the mission to prepare the Passover (Luke xxii. 8). We subsequently find this distinguished position of John in connection with Peter, appearing as permanent in the Acts. In this book he everywhere appears, with Peter alone, at the head of the apostolic band; he therefore and Peter were decidedly acknowledged as the most gifted, most blessed, and most important pillars of the *Church*,—an acknowledgment which the Lord's treatment of them would seem to have sanctioned. With reference, however, to Peter, Jesus had in some respects given John the precedence, and in others postponed him to that apostle. In personal relation to Christ, he was the first, the friend of Jesus, who lay on His breast, to whom the Lord committed the care of his mother—whom in this respect He put in His own position (John xiii. 23; xix. 26, 27; xxi. 7, 20–25). But in his vocation to found and guide the Church of Christ, Peter was preferred to him, as well as to the other apostles (Matt. xvi. 18, 19; Luke xxii. 31; John xxi. 15). This appointment of Christ formed no legal privilege; it only made the actual natural relations in which the two apostles stood to each other and to Him clear to the Church, and obtained for them the recognition of the community. Hence these relations are seen to exist also in the Acts of the Apostles. Peter everywhere appears in heroic greatness of deed; John walks in mysterious silence near the mighty pioneer-apostle. He must consequently, as far as force of natural character is concerned, be esteemed as far less important than Peter, if the perfectly equal respect they received did not lead us to infer the actual equilibrium of these personalities. We must then seek the distinctive gifts of John in those less conspicuous qualities of heart and mind which are far removed from this prominent activity, and

¹ [So Clem. Alex., *Quis Dives Salv.* c. 36 : τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι.—ED.]

expect to find him as far superior to Peter in his powers of mental contemplation, as Peter is to him in powers¹ of energetic action. This expectation is confirmed, as soon as we compare the first Epistle of John with the first Epistle of Peter. The first Epistle of John forms a homogeneous appendix to the fourth Gospel.¹ In it are displayed that disposition which rises to lyric fervour, that penetration which descends into the abysses of speculative contemplation, united with that deep strong ardour, bursting forth at intervals, which is peculiar to such a mind, and which here appears ennobled by the holy acuteness of a sublime purity. These separate features, however, when jointly contemplated, bear the impress of sublime, childlike simplicity, and are encompassed by a halo of lonely solemnity. The negative side of this said subjective disposition appears in the circumstance, that here, as everywhere, John brings forward but few historical references; in his writings the actual is merged and explained in the contemplative. Its positive side is displayed in the powerful apprehension of all worldly relations; *e.g.*, in the words, ‘Children, it is the last time;’ while the poetic flights of the fervour which pervades all his expressions, is often prominent, as perhaps in the passage where he so solemnly addresses the fathers, the young men, and the children (1 John ii. 13). His enlightened penetration is shown, when he says of God, He is light, and in Him is no darkness; of Christ, The Life was manifested; of Christians, Ye have an anointing, and know all things; while the product of the subtlest speculative tendency is seen when, *e.g.*, he defines sin as the transgression of the law. Yet he is no philosophic or poetic idealist; his mind has a truly practical turn. This is seen even in his ardent zeal; as, *e.g.*, when he says, He that doeth sin is of the devil. This ardour sometimes kindles into sublimest purity. When he says, Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer, we are reading the very soul of a Christian man, to whom the world of thought has almost become the world of reality. But when it is said, Little children, abide in Him, we recognize the tone of his own noble simplicity; and in the words, This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith, is expressed the silent triumph of the man, who, by his unexcitable, almost leisurely seeming solemnity, has left the world certainly as important an apostolic blessing as any of his fellow-apostles have done in their more stirring performances. In the first Epistle of Peter, we recognize an apostle of an entirely opposite character from John, though one with him in Christian spirit. We find here the *aspiring* spirit, contemplating with peculiar delight the Christian hope, the incorruptible inheritance, and rejoicing with joy unspeakable, and full of glory, in the assurance of the Lord’s return; the *preaching* spirit, encouraging, exhorting, consoling, and even declaring of the Lord Jesus, that He himself preached to the spirits in prison; the dauntless *believing* spirit, looking upon himself and his fellow-Christians as a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, to

¹ Ebrard’s *Gospel History*, p. 119.

show forth the praises of Christ; the *ordering* and *arranging* spirit, giving special exhortations, now to Christians in general, now to servants, to women, to men, to elders, to young Christians; the *animated* spirit, dealing in concrete views, loving to speak in figures, parables, and examples,—*e.g.*, of the gold purified by the fire, of the sincere milk of the word, of the precious corner-stone, of the typical obedience of Sarah; the *valiant* and *warlike* spirit, looking upon the adversary the devil as a roaring lion; finally, the spirit *purified by suffering*, who would stop the mouth of adversaries not with evil, but with well-doing;—in a word, we find everywhere that it is the converted Peter who is speaking to us.

His second Epistle also testifies to the same relation of the two apostles to each other, and to the Lord, by still exhibiting the decided and great contrast of their respective peculiarities. When these two disciples first heard from the pious women the confused report of the Lord's resurrection, they both ran to the sepulchre. John ran the more quickly; the impulse of his soul was more fervid, his enthusiasm was more soaring, more angel-like. Arrived at the grave, however, either reverence, or deep anxiety, or fearful anticipation suddenly restrained him. The prompt resolution of Peter, however, here gave him the precedence, and he went first into the grave. After the resurrection, we find the disciples, during the long interval of forty days, again on the Sea of Galilee; and again they pass the night upon the water, occupied in fishing. In the twilight of the morning, they see a mysterious personage standing on the shore. John is the first to recognize Him; the eagle glance of his mind seems to extend even to his bodily eye, and he says, ‘It is the Lord!’ At the word of the *discriminative* apostle, the *energetic* apostle plunges into the water. It is Peter who swims to meet Jesus. In the high-priest's palace, which he entered together with Peter, John maintained his exalted and silent individuality before the obtrusiveness of rude accusers, while Peter was driven first to make himself conspicuous, and then to deny his Master. Hence, also, he passed as it were in heavenly concealment through the tribulations of the early Church, while the other great apostles were baptized with a baptism of blood, one after another. Hence, while the other apostles were agitating the great capitals of the then known world by the preaching of the Gospel, John died in peace as Bishop of Ephesus, one of the churches founded by Paul. And hence, finally, Peter was the rock upon which the Church of Christ was built at its commencement; it was his agency which pervaded the apostolic Church, and gave to it that energetic tendency to go forth into all the world, in the power of that Spirit from above which was bestowed upon him, while the contemplative tendency, the tendency of John, could not but retire into the background. But when the enlightenment of the Church, its perfection in inner life and spirituality, was to be promoted; when the sign of the Son of man was to dart forth like lightning, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same; the agency of John might well be

the most conspicuous, and perhaps it may be reserved to the Spirit of St John, the sublime son of thunder, the dazzling lightning, the purifying storm, to be that influence under whose light and warmth the Church is to be adorned as a bride for the coming Bridegroom.¹

As is the disciple, so is his Gospel. We will not any further refer to the various judgments that have been pronounced upon this much prized and much despised composition. They stand in more glaring contrast to each other than opinions concerning any of the other Gospels. It is from the hand of an angel, says one.² A phantom-like production! says another. On one side, it is said to be the heart of Christ;³ on another, it is called mystically confused and *lengthened out*. Certainly John had to bear the cross in his own person, and he has ever had to bear it in his Gospel during its propagation through the world. Yet the unpopular Evangelist was happy, in the midst of all misconception, in the reality of his view of the Lord's glory; and spirits akin to his have ever been so, in spite of their isolation in the world.⁴

The fourth Gospel bears the most distinct impress of the above-named characteristics of John. We find in it a profound insight which seizes the historical only in its most pregnant incidents, and contemplates in these, on one side, the whole fulness of the actual, on the other, the whole depth of the ideal. John the Baptist here represents the whole series of pre-Christian Old Testament prophets, through whose instrumentality christological light dawned upon the world; while Peter and John represent the continued prevalence of this light in the world after Christ's return to the Father. In a few chief incidents, the Evangelist shows us, first, how the light and life, after its appearance, attracted the receptive; and then how the unresponsive turned away from it; then, next, how the contrast between light and darkness was exhibited in more developed form; and, finally, how the signs of the victory which is destined to annihilate the darkness appeared. Thus the history which the Evangelist relates, is thoroughly penetrated by the ideality of his view of the world. The spiritual penetration of his view of Christ appears also in the freshness of his world of thought. As his facts are thoughts, so are his thoughts life. According to his mode of expression, the knowledge of eternal life and the true historic view of Christ is the knowledge of the Father. This inwardness often bears in his Gospel the lovely blossom of a lyric fervour, especially in the farewell discourses, where wave upon wave of inspired, sacred, evangelical feeling appear in a rich succession, which obtuseness of mind has more than once most miserably misconceived. The profundity of the Evangelist has laid down in this Gospel principles of the deepest and purest speculation, principles whose whole depth, when contrasted with the efforts hitherto made by philosophy, stand like

¹ We can here only hint at the fact, that a like spirit is very clearly manifested in the Apocalypse, or, at the converse, that the Apocalypse points to a similar one.

² Herder.

³ It is so called by Ernesti.

⁴ E.g., Heinrich Suso.

the Jungfrau peak among the Alps. And what a wonderful polar relation to that eagle glance, which loses itself in the sunny heights of truth, is borne by that swift, lightning-like, blasting, holy indignation, wherewith the Evangelist sees the condemning light of the Gospel fall upon the world, or upon 'the Jews,' the worldly spirits of Israel. He even assumes an appearance of contradiction to designate that desperate hatred of the light in the strongest terms. 'His own received Him not. But as many as received Him,' &c. 'This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light.' 'Ye seek Me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves.' 'Why do ye not understand My speech?—Ye are of your father the devil.' How forcible is the reproof: 'Because I tell you the truth, ye believe Me not!' And in the midst of all this fervid severity, we still recognize the constant prevalence of that quiet and simple spirit, whose sacred repose and sabbatic peace are forcibly contrasted with the busy restlessness of its opponents, and which is ever a characteristic of the Evangelists through every line of the Gospels. How characteristic is the scene at Jacob's well, when Christ, so opportunely resting at the well, discloses to a Samaritan woman, with so much freedom, the marvels of truth! The manner, too, in which Christ says to His disciples, at the close of the fourteenth chapter, 'Arise, let us go hence,' and then remains with His disciples, sunk in the long and continuous reflections which fill three chapters, without changing the place, is also singularly striking in this respect. These were the moments in which, most especially, the view of the disciple was entirely blended with the deeply stirred, yet solemn frame of his Master. The whole of the twenty-first chapter, also, is pervaded by that sabbatic peace which is best defined as the characteristic peculiarity of St John's mind. The Evangelist ends his narrative by truly reporting a falsely interpreted saying of Christ. Its full interpretation is reserved to the coming of Christ. Thus the end, when Christ the revealed Word will explain and illuminate the destinies of all, is connected with the beginning, in which the Word and the destinies of all were still resting in the bosom of the Father.

The ancient Church made a fitting selection in the symbol it appropriated to the fourth Evangelist. As the eagle in his lofty soaring attains, in a few great efforts, those pauses of still hovering, when he rests upon his outspread pinions, entranced by the glory of the sun, and, in transports of delight, bends his course towards it; so did the Evangelist quickly free himself from Galilee, from John the Baptist, from the ideal of his mother Salome, and even from the expectation of having as much influence in his own way within the Church as Peter, or breaking up new ground in the world like Paul, and make it both the labour and rest of his life to contemplate and to exhibit the spiritual glory, the light of the world, in Christ and in His history. He was called, in profound and blessed contemplation, to perceive in the Gospel history, and in simple, yet sublime

touches, to exhibit the ideal lights which break through Christ's words and works—the lyric tone of the peace which pervades His manner of acting and expressing Himself ; the lightning-like flashes of the conflict between the Spirit of Christ and the spirit of the world, accompanied as they were by the rolling thunders ; the life of Godhead in the sufferings of the Lamb, or the enjoyment of eternal peace in the depth of atoning woes ; the dawn of the glorification of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Church. Hence his Gospel is the central point of ideal Christology, placing all those expressions of christological life which relate to it in their proper light, and teaching us rightly to estimate all the developments which have resulted from the dispersion of the fruitful seed of the divine Logos¹ throughout the world. All the guesses of philosophy that the unity of the Eternal Spirit was the ideal principle of the world—all genuine poetic feeling appearing as the blossom of a momentary union with the Eternal Spirit—all manifestations of pure enthusiasm which suffer thought to appear through the tone of feeling, and exhibit feeling in the light of thought ; but especially all those inward festivals of Christian peace, in which hearts become so one with the Father in the Son, through the Holy Ghost, that the troubles and labours which had perplexed them are terminated—and all the outward festivals of the Church in which the greatest facts of history glitter with spiritual glory throughout the world, and ring aloud over the earth the eternal thoughts of God incorporated in established customs, so that the dawn of an eternal and untroubled Sabbath already appears upon the high places of the civilised world ; in a word, all the incidents of festal spiritual life upon earth, in its reference to its eternal destination,—are echoes of the prevailing tone of this Gospel ; and if this apostle is regarded as a prince in the kingdom of Christ, possessing one of the twelve thrones, it may be said that he is the prince of that province whose situation is the highest, and whose beauty is the most tranquil,—that in his realm the noblest vines flourish on the high and picturesque mountains, whose very peaks are surrounded by a genial and fragrant atmosphere, while in the morning sun which illumines the gothic domes of his domains, and lights the festal processions upon their glittering paths, hovers the eagle that brought him his pen from the hand of the Lord.

If, then, the life of Christ is exhibited in the first Gospel with reference to the historical destiny of the world, and especially its tragic events ; in the second, to the powers of the world ; in the third, to the human heart, and especially the heart neglected, suffering, and feeling its need of consolation ; and in the fourth, to the eternal ideals, and to lyric and meditative views of them,—it still appears to us as unalterably one, under each new aspect, in every essential form of human life. This reference may, however,

¹ Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 46 : οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοὶ εἰσι, καὶ ἀνθεῖοι ἐνομίσθησαν, οἷον ἐν "Ελλήσι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειος καὶ οἱ ὄμοιοι αὐτῶν, &c.

be viewed from four points of view. First, the Gospels teach us the difference of the instruments generally employed to communicate the Gospel, and enable us to estimate the value of this difference. Then, on the other hand, they point out the various forms and degrees of receptivity, and of felt need of salvation, existing in the world. If, then, we view the whole dark world in the light cast upon it by Christ's Gospel, we may say that we possess a Gospel of all tragic historical occurrences, a Gospel of all forces, a Gospel of all humanity, a Gospel of all ideality. When, however, we refer the variety of this negative fulness of the world, which Christ will fill and illumine, to Him the Head, He appears to us as the purely historical hero, in whom the suffering of the historical curse became, through perfected historical fidelity, the reconciliation of the world, the Gospel ; as the Lord of powers, whose harmony He restores, whose new doctrine it is, that with authority He commandeth even the unclean spirits, and who bequeaths to His disciples power over serpents and poisons (Mark xvi. 18) ; as fairest of the children of men, the friend of the human race, who listens to all the sighs of humanity, counts all its tears, who meets the funeral procession of mankind as He did that before the gate of Nain, as a helper and consoler ; and, finally, as the Elect, the Only-begotten of the Father, in whom the Father beholds Himself, in whom the creative thought of God is one with reality, and whose glorification in the kingdom of the Spirit results in the recovery of the obscured ideality of the whole world, who elevates human nature with Himself into the free and blessed kingdom of the Spirit.

The four Gospels thus form a cycle in which Christ's glory is exhibited in the fulness of His life, and His nature developed in the four chief forms of life. Three of these forms stand in evidently sharp contrast to each other; they are symbolically designated by the three forms of animal life. But if the fourth, which is denoted by the figure of the man, is to represent merely the temperament or the higher unity of the other three forms, it would seem, indeed, that we might expect to find in Luke's Gospel a unity of the other three. Now it cannot be ignored that such a unity is actually presented, or, in other words, that the respective views of each separate Evangelist are re-echoed therein ;—that of Matthew, for instance, in his communication of a genealogy and the notions connected therewith ; that of Mark, in the exhibition of the constant miracles and journeys of Christ ; and lastly, that of John, especially in the prominence given to the circumstance, that Jesus frequently continued whole nights in prayer (chap. vi. 1, ix. 29, xi. 1, xxi. 37). It is, however, equally true, that the peculiarity of Luke is, as we have already seen, strongly contrasted with the peculiarities of the other Evangelists. It would also oppose the idea of the organic relation of Christ to His Church, if His fulness were represented with equal power and emphasis by one instrument. How then shall we explain this apparent contradiction, that one Gospel should pre-eminently represent the divine humanity of Christ, and yet should not appear

merely as the unity of the three others, which each give special prominence to one essential christological relation? We obtain an explanation of this difficulty by an accurate distinction between the different stages of human life. Man, as such, appears as the climax of creation, in whom the above-named general forms of life celebrate their higher unity. Paradisaic man, however, existed but for a short period; and historic man, as a fallen being, so lost that height and harmony of life, that he can now, in a humanity subject to weakness and limitation, appear as a special and separate form of life beside the three animal forms; and it is in this limited condition that this fourth living creature represents the historical state of mankind. It is through its imperfect coincidence with the idea that history becomes tragic. It represents a deterioration, in which even that which is most noble in human nature generally appears only in fragments. In this dislocation of human powers, actual suffering faithfulness and pure ideality seemed to be most widely separated. The one is struggling, suffering, bleeding, in the midst of the reality of actual national life. The other is soaring far above reality, in the regions of philosophy and poetry, and is often celebrating her highest triumphs while reality is at its most pitiable state of depression. Between these extremes of natural life are seen, on one side, the ardent zeal of powerful and pious spirits, exercised in manifold and energetic rebukes; on the other, that humanity, specially so called, which no sooner casts a look upon human need and misery, than, with a compassion which no prejudice can restrain, it makes it forthwith its life-task to soothe, to help, and to heal. This deterioration, however, of the christological element is put an end to in the life of Jesus. In Him, man as such, the ideal man, becomes historical; historic man, ideal. His life embraces, in wondrous union and harmony, and in infinite power, fulness, and purity, all the vital powers of humanity, all its aspirations after the heights of absolute perfection.

If, then, we glance once more at the prophetic symbol in which we have a typical reflection of the spiritual relations of human life, of Christology, and especially of the characteristic relations existing between the four Evangelists, the varying hues of signification in the fourth living creature (the human) may now be pointed out.

This human form first expresses the notion of the union of the three other living creatures; it has a reference to the ideal of human nature in its perfection. But it also represents man in his historical weakness and limitation, as he appears co-ordinately with the other forms as a fourth; not merely, perhaps, because the ox bleeds for him in symbolical worship, because the lion terrifies him, because the eagle soars over his head independently of him; but rather because his historic destiny, with its need of sacrifice, the heroic activity of the zealous messengers of God, and the sublime mysteries of ideal life generally, confront him as strange and terrible powers, with whom he is outwardly combined, but not inwardly united. And when he would, in his highest efforts, unite himself with them,

this union is ever but a partial one. If he sacrifices himself for the sake of his country, the lion opposes him as his destroyer, as was the case with Huss; if he walks in the ways of the lion, he often renders himself a grievous scourge to others, as proved by the Hussites; if he soars with the eagle, he generally forgets the wants of his fellow-men, as many idealists and mystics have done. Hence he is called upon, in his weakness, to concentrate himself, that he may do what is most human in a human manner, may check human misery with all the might of such divine strength as still remains in him, till the grace of God completes its work by guiding the ardent inward co-operation of those human powers which seem outwardly separated and severed, and restores harmony by the sending of the Son of man.

It is then limited humanity, rather than humanity in general, which is denoted by the cherubic symbol of the man. The notion of human unity, which is involved therein, is an indication of real unity, which was in many ways pointed to by the Holy of Holies of the Jewish temple as a unity to come, though it was definitely represented by no separate symbol, for the sake of giving the impression that it had not yet appeared. This unity was exemplified in an action, at the moment when the high priest tremblingly entered the Holy of Holies and sprinkled the mercy-seat. The tables of the law represented the roaring of the Lion of Judah; the sacrificial blood represented the Lamb of God, or sacrifice; the priest was the instrument of active compassion; the whole figure of the cherubim at such a moment, under the awe of the Lord's presence, spoke mysteriously of the eternal idea of the spirit of revelation. The power of this atonement was indeed only symbolic, and soon departed; it was founded, however, on the continual intervention and government of the incarnate love of God, in the depths of Israel's life.

When the God-man appeared in Christ, in whom the union of all human powers and forms of power was not only realized, but also confirmed and glorified, the old symbolism of the tabernacle had answered its purpose, and the actual life appeared in its place. But the life of Christ, which now entered the world to pervade it, and to change it into pure light and life, entered it in that four-fold form of human life, that its whole fulness might be poured out therein, because it was only by such an entrance that it could certainly comprehend and win the world in all its forms of life; on the one hand, in all its instruments, on the other, in all its necessities.

There are individuals whose gifts remind us of Matthew, others who represent Mark, others again in whom resemblances to Luke or John appear. These all draw, according to their measure, from the fulness of Christ. For the reception of these manifold gifts there exist so many needs, these encounter the fulness of Christ in the form of utter poverty and nakedness. Wavering communities, ever ready to be unfaithful to themselves, need the heroes of suffering

fidelity; weak multitudes, tormented by demons, cry for instruments of vigorous and delivering power; the poor and despised of this world long for the Gospel to heal their wounds through the angels of Christian philanthropy; the ever impending torpor of a dull realism and coarse utilitarianism needs sacred spirits who, themselves drawing from the source of eternal life, may be able to extend to the ageing Church the chalice of rejuvenescence.¹

The Church of Christ exhibits these fundamental forms wholesale. The priestly element in the Church reminds us of the view and gifts of Matthew; Mark seems to live again in energetic and powerful revival preachers; the founders of Christian institutions of mercy, the instruments of help to the needy of all kinds, represent the Lord according to Luke's view; while theology is radically after the style of John, and is indeed ever in a state of declension, when the tone of that apostle seems either strange or offensive to it. In the life of the Church this tone resounds in sacred songs.

These four forms, in their reference to the unity of the divine-human life, are reflected also in the Christian State. Justice and magistracy in the State, for instance, correspond with priestliness in the Church; administration and military order have an internal reference to their counterparts among the powers of the world to come; in those humane institutions by which the State cares for the relief of human need, especially in medical institutions, we find an echo of Christian pity; while, lastly, science and art will only correspond with their ideals, so far as they maintain their natural reference to the Church and theology, and through these as media, to Christ.

Since, then, Christ enters by His Spirit, according to these various forms, into His elect instruments, by them into His Church, by the Church into the State, and by the State into the whole world, He places the rights and value of human peculiarities in the clearest light, nay, protects them even in their form of relative partialities, whether these partialities are displayed in the prevalance of historical fidelity, theocratic activity, universal humanity, or quiet and contemplative idealism. Their rights are defended by the fact that they all exist in perfect harmony in Christ, and that in their united efforts they represent the fundamental forms of edification for His Church. It is only when they sever from or misconceive each other, and withdraw themselves from obedience to the Spirit of Christ, which would bind them together into a real unity, as they already, abstractedly considered, form an ideal one, and have the germ of a real one in Him, that they become blameable; e.g., a humanity which seeks to sever itself from Christian firmness and power, a priestliness apart from the ideality of free judgment, an ideality removed from common life. In such forms they are but phantoms of the life they should exhibit, and even inimical to, and inconsistent with, that life. Hence modern preachers of apostolic succession, and clerical priests, are adversaries to the doctrine of the

¹ [Compare Westcott's *Introd.* p. 204.—ED.]

true atonement, and modern idealists are opponents of John. They are, however, but phantoms. For the Lord triumphantly continues His work, the development of His glory, by quickening and purifying faithful men who exhibit such partialities. It is from such partialities, so far as they remain Christian in their proportion and tendency, so far as they gravitate towards Christ, the centre of attraction to all life, that, as the result of the continuous purification which they receive from contact with each other, those peculiarities burst forth which develop in ever-increasing brightness and beauty, that immortal germ which they bear within them. Ever more and more is one reflected in another, each in all ; ever more and more do their contrasts become expressions of the fulness and power of their unity. It is in such a consecration that we behold the four Gospels. How manifold are the contrasts they exhibit ! As the eagle soars high above those living creatures who are chained by their nature to earth, so does John soar, in his ideality, above the other three Evangelists ; on which account Clement of Alexandria, a partial and idealistic theologian, called his Gospel the spiritual, and dared to designate the others, as contrasted with his, the corporeal Gospels. On the other hand, Matthew differs from the other three by making historical truth, as it glorifies the true King of the Jews in His atoning sufferings, and the illustration furnished by the Old Testament to the New, the central points of His delineation. Mark also proportions his efforts to the aim he had in view ; he leaves it to others to report the discourses of Jesus, and to delineate the inner workings of His life. His hero is the Lion who even in death shakes heaven and earth with His cry, and is soon upon the scene again, conquering and redeeming every creature. The aim of Luke, compared with that of the others, is displayed in the force of his universalism : he balances the seventy disciples for the world in general, against the twelve apostles for Israel. The position of the Gospels is also characteristic : the Gospel of historical truth and that of the ideal perfection of Christ are farthest apart ; they form the advanced and rear guards of the company. Near to the Gospel of the Lord's powerful agency stands the Gospel of His mild and compassionate control, the Angel next the Lion. And if the combination of the two first Gospels exhibits the Lord under the contrast of victim and sacrificer, the combination of the two latter expresses the contrast of love ever acting in prayer, and love ever praying in the midst of action. The unity of all is, however, expressed in the fact that they all form but one Gospel, that they all glorify the one Christ.

It will now, therefore, be our task to exhibit first of all that representation of the life of Jesus which is derived from the four Gospels in combination, and then to bring prominently forward, by an examination of each separate Gospel, the specific nature of their respective views of Christ. These examinations will indeed be but attempts, but even with all their deficiencies they may direct attention to the delicate yet decided organic unity of the four Gospel

forms of life, and the indissolubility of their organisms; and if this be in any measure their result, the nuisance of the now prevailing atomistic and talmudistic criticism of the Gospels will be stopped in its career. The greater advantage, however, would be the positive one of more decidedly exhibiting the fulness of Christ in the Gospels, their variety being made the clearer by the more developed delineation of their unity, their unity by a nicer discrimination of their variety.

NOTES.

1. Of the apostolic labours of Matthew, especially his later ones beyond the limits of Palestine, and of his end, tradition has much to tell (comp. Winer, *R. W. B.* i. 73). Eusebius relates that, after writing his Gospel, he directed his efforts to other nations (iii. 24). His new sphere of labour has been variously designated by various authorities. Macedonia, Upper Syria, Persia, Parthia, and Media, have each been named, but the tradition which points out Ethiopia as the scene of his ministry has received most credit. In the times of Clement of Alexandria his martyrdom was not known of, but a severe ascetic course of life was ascribed to him. He was subsequently reckoned among the martyrs. A comparison of the passage in his Gospel (chap. xxiv. 15, &c.) which seems to hint that the time for the departure of the Christians from Jerusalem was at hand, with the statement of Eusebius, that the Christians departed to Pella, a town in the hilly district beyond Jordan, would lead us to seek for the last traces of Matthew in this direction. Pantænus (according to Eusebius) afterwards found his Gospel, in the Hebrew language, in the hands of the Christians of a country called India, by which we must probably understand Arabia (Neander, *Church History*, i. 113 [Bohn's Tr.]). In this direction, then, *i.e.*, beyond Pella and towards Arabia, Matthew seems to have terminated his career. It is Bartholomew, however, whom Eusebius designates as properly the apostle of the Arabians.

2. Tradition is very unanimous in its accounts, that Mark left Rome to preach the Gospel in Egypt, where he founded Christian churches, and became the first Bishop of Alexandria. According to Jerome, he died in the eighth year of Nero's reign. According to the Alexandrian Chronicle, he suffered martyrdom in the reign of Trajan, being burned by the idolaters.

3. The tradition that Luke was a painter is of very recent origin. It is found in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Nicephorus, who wrote in the fourteenth century. According to Eusebius Luke preached in Dalmatia, Gaul, Italy, and Macedonia. Nicephorus also makes his labours lie in the same direction, by reporting that he suffered martyrdom in Greece. According to Isidorus Hispalensis and the Martyrologies, he died in Bithynia.

4. When Paul was at Jerusalem for the last time (Acts xxi. 18), John seems to have been no longer there. It is probable that the Virgin was already dead, and that he had departed thence.

Whither 'John first betook himself after leaving Jerusalem,' says Credner (*Einl.* 215), 'is a circumstance veiled in utter obscurity. It could not have been to Ephesus, as Paul would then have avoided that place (comp. Rom. xv. 20, 2 Cor. x. 16, Gal. ii. 7, 8), and would also have spoken in different terms to the Ephesian elders on his return from his third journey. Neither can we admit the presence of John at Ephesus at the time when Paul sent the Epistle to the Ephesians into those districts. But that he was really there subsequently, is testified by history (*Iren. adv. Hæres.* iii. 3. 4).' According to Clement of Alexandria, he was banished for a time to the island of Patmos by a tyrant, and came to Ephesus after the death of his persecutor. Domitian is afterwards named as the tyrant by whom John was banished. Tertullian relates the tradition, that John was, before his banishment, thrown into boiling oil at Rome, without suffering any harm. According to Irenæus, he lived till the time of Trajan. Epiphanius says that he attained the age of ninety-four; Chrysostom, that he lived to be one hundred and twenty. On the traditions concerning his advanced years, comp. Neander, *Planting and Training, &c.*, i. 411 [Bohn's Ed.]

According to Mark iii. 17, John, together with his brother James, received a surname from the Lord Jesus. They were called Boanerges. Von Ammon supposes (*Gesch. des Lebens Jesu*, p. 77) that Mark translated this word incorrectly, *sons of thunder*, and that it rather means *hot-headed ones*. Mark, however, is not merely the reporter of the Hebrew, but also of the Greek expression, and it is not as a translator but as an Evangelist that he gives the Greek name. As a Hebrew too, he must well have known that רגש might be so rendered. This designation of the sons of Zebedee has often been referred to their expression of indignation, when they desired to call down fire from heaven upon a Samaritan town, because it did not receive the Lord Jesus (Luke ix. 51). Concerning this name, comp. the article of Gurlitt in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1829, No. 4; and that of the author in the same periodical for the year 1839, No. 1, *Ueber die Authentie der vier Evang.* p. 60. The Lord would scarcely have bestowed upon His disciples a surname which would have attached to them a lasting stigma; nor could He, with His perfect knowledge of nature, look upon thunder as merely a 'senseless destructive power,' and employ it as a symbolic name in this sense; the phenomenon of thunder was surely too significant, beautiful, and holy in His eyes, for such a purpose. Undoubtedly, thunder was to His mind a sublime phenomenon, testifying to the Father's glory. In fact, neither moral praise nor moral blame seem intended in this designation. The word denotes a special temperament. As Simon was surnamed a rock, on account of his manly, powerful, and zealous activity, so were James and John surnamed sons of thunder, on account of their calm and lofty temperament, which could yet suddenly flash forth into light and power like lightning. The word was the indorsement of their peculiarity and

of their process of development ; it included both the reproof of their sinful effervescence, and the loving acknowledgment of the characteristic features of their noble and soaring spirits. [The etymology and significance of this name are most fully considered by Lampe in his *Comment. in Joan. Proleg. i. 2.—Ed.*]

SECOND BOOK.

THE HISTORICAL DELINEATION OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION.

SECTION I.

THE PRINCIPAL CHRONOLOGICAL PERIODS ASCERTAINED.

IN undertaking a chronologically arranged history of the life of the Lord Jesus Christ, our first task must necessarily be a comparison of the four Gospels, with reference to the order of events communicated by their respective statements.¹ If apparent or actual discrepancies are discovered by this process, our next effort must be an attempt to ascertain the true sequence ; and when this has been discovered, to point out, and if possible to explain, the several departures therefrom, by the peculiar position of the Evangelist with respect to the objective Gospel history.

That the Evangelists do not all relate events in the same order, is an acknowledged fact. Of late, indeed, a considerable mass of seeming discrepancies have been added to these actual discrepancies ; as, e.g., by the view that John relates the call of the first disciples as taking place at a period differing from that stated by the synoptists, reports Christ's agony before His crucifixion, and at another place, and differs from them also concerning the day of the crucifixion. But though a more thorough comprehension of the Gospel history scatters such obscurities as these, it yet brings also into clearer light such discrepancies of chronology as actually exist. Those arising from a comparison between John and the synoptists may first be noticed. According to the latter (Matt. iv. 12 ; Mark i. 14 ; Luke iv. 14), it might be assumed that Jesus commenced

¹ [‘Singuli non sufficiunt ad chronologiam historiae de Jesu Christo coagmentandam : conjuncti, satisfaciunt, ita inter se congruentes, ut unius operis instar sint eorum scripta.’ Bengel’s *Ordo Temporum*, p. 267 (ed. 1741).—Ed.]

His public ministry in Galilee, and that, indeed, after John had been cast into prison ; while from the statement of John it appears, that Jesus, after His first public appearance in Jerusalem, laboured for a period, contemporaneously with the Baptist, in Judea. The discrepancy may, indeed, be reduced to a merely seeming one, arising from an inaccuracy in the earlier Evangelists, viz., that they all omit Christ's first official attendance at the Passover, and thus confuse His return from the banks of Jordan after His baptism with His return from the same place after that festival. The inaccuracy is certainly sufficiently prominent to assume the appearance of an actual discrepancy, until it is explained by the origin of the first three Gospels. But even the synoptists, independently considered, often differ in details in their respective orders. In the history of the temptation, for instance, Matthew makes the temptation upon the pinnacle of the temple precede that upon the high mountain ; while Luke inverts this order. The latter places the occurrence at Nazareth, and the imimical disposition of the Nazarenes to the Lord, before His journeyings (chap. iv. 16) ; while Matthew brings forward this event after Jesus had already been sojourning some time at Capernaum (xiii. 54). The different positions occupied by the Lord's Prayer in these two Gospels may also be mentioned here (Matt. vi. 9; Luke xi. 2) ; while an inspection of a synopsis will immediately show other details which might be added. Finally, the Evangelist Luke seems even to confuse his own order, by relating Christ's entry into Bethany at chap. x. 38, and then saying, chap. xvii. 11, that He passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee ; though this, indeed, may be explained by the remark, that he gives the occurrences of several journeys consecutively. If, then, the fact is proved, that the Evangelists thus frequently differ from each other as to the order of events, the question arises, what is the rule by which their statements are to be reconciled ?

First, we meet with the arrangement which attributes to each Evangelist an equal, and even perfect correctness, with respect to the matter in question. This result of harmony was connected with the rigidity of ancient, and especially of Lutheran orthodoxy. Andrew Osiander, in his *Harmonia Evangeliorum*, proceeds upon the principle, that 'since the Evangelists were inspired, they could not but write truth, and consequently gave the discourses of Jesus *verbotenus*, and His discourses and acts in strictest consecutive order. Now as each of the four Evangelists is said to have written in consecutive order, while the same events are recorded at an earlier period by one, and at a later by others, no resource is left us but to take evidently parallel and identical occurrences for non-identical, and to suppose that the same occurrence, accompanied by the same circumstances, was frequently repeated.'¹ A composition would consequently have to be made, into which all these repetitions

¹ See Ebrard, *Gospel History*, pp. 49 and 58. [The blindness of sensible and learned men to any other than chronological order is exhibited by Bishop Marsh in the third volume of his edition of Michaelis, Pt. ii. p. 16.—ED.]

must be compressed. A want of life was the fundamental fault of this view, by which a perplexed, confusing multiplicity of Gospel facts, a multiplicity resting upon a very precarious tenure, was obtained, and the great, clear, and self-certifying unity of the Gospel history was lost.¹ After the view of Osiander was abandoned, it became necessary to consider the separate Evangelists, with a view to discover which among them had preserved the groundwork of the true sequence, according to which the statements of the rest were to be arranged. Chemnitz (*Harmonice Evangelicæ*) decided for Matthew, yet did not follow him throughout. J. A. Bengel also (*Richtige Harmonie der Evang.*) considered that Matthew had observed chronological order, while Mark and Luke had allowed themselves more freedom than this would give them. The assumption that Matthew at least gives us to understand that he intended to write with strict regard to chronology, has of late been made use of in opposing the credibility of his Gospel. On the other hand, however, the persuasion that Matthew groups events according to their real connection, and follows this order in his statements, has been expressed with increasing certainty, especially by Olshausen (*Commentary on the Gospels*, Introd. p. 18), Hase (*Das Leben Jesu*, p. 3), Ebrard (*Gospel History*, p. 66).

They who regard the Gospel of Mark as the basis of the two other synoptical Gospels, cannot but give it the preference with regard to chronology also; as, e.g., Weisse (*die Evang. Gesch.* i. 66, 295). As the critical fates would have it, Mark obtained a recognition in this respect even from Schleiermacher, who, wishing to prove that the testimony of Papias does not apply to our extant Gospel according to Mark, refers to the declaration of Papias, that Mark wrote *οὐ τάξει*, while the present Gospel evidently follows a chronological order and decided plan. The chronological sequence of Mark is indeed frequently such, that everything takes place *εὐθέως*, in rapid succession. His order is, at all events, generally founded on the true order, as will be subsequently shown. Others again (compare Schott, *Isagoge*, p. 107; Zahn, *Das Reich Gottes auf Erden*, Pt. ii. p. 4) give Luke the preference. But the third Gospel, as before pointed out, exhibits as little as the first and second, a distinctly arranged order in details. ‘In the course of this Gospel, a similar indistinctness concerning the sequence of events is manifested, as in the other two; Luke, for the most part, narrates event after event, without any notice of time (chap. iv. 16, 31, v. 12, &c.), and sometimes alternately uses the indefinite transitions *μετὰ ταῦτα* (v. 27), *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν* (v. 17, viii. 22, &c.).’ Olshausen, *Commentary*, i. 19.

Our inquiries after the true order have now brought us to the Gospel of John. And here also that ruling spirit of the Evangelists, which found higher and certainly more important principles to influence their delineations of the life of Christ than those of chronological sequence, seems to cut off all hope of obtaining abund-

¹ See Ebrard.

ant chronological foundations. The principle of John's view of the Gospel was a decidedly ideal and christological one; we are not therefore surprised to find that the leading incidents of his development do not coincide with the leading chronological periods. B. Jakobi¹ rightly remarks, 'The definitions of time in this Gospel are so delivered, that it is seen that the question with John is not to furnish a chronological, and least of all a complete chronological sketch of the life of Christ. Notes of time, when they are found, serve for the most part only to aid our conception of the position of an event or discourse; or to explain some circumstance of the narrative; or they obtrude themselves upon the narrator without design on his part, as integral parts of the occurrence which he is relating, by vivid representations of his own past experiences.' In confirmation of this may be cited the circumstance, that John does not more nearly define the feast of the Jews, chap. v. 1, and thereby introduces an element of uncertainty into his chronology of the life of Jesus, which has presented many difficulties to investigators. Nevertheless Jakobi rightly asserts, that the Gospel of John must always furnish the foundation, according to which the statements of the other Evangelists must be arranged, with respect to their historical sequence; though he expresses this assertion too strongly in the remark that this Gospel is the only representation of the life of Jesus which is authentic, thoroughly credible, and, though very incomplete, yet perfectly self-consistent and accurate in all its several details, &c. Ebrard also expresses his conviction, that it was the intention of John to write consecutively and chronologically (p. 121). Neander is of the same opinion. He shows² that, from the circumstance that the paschal festival is only once mentioned by the synoptists, and that at the close of Christ's earthly course nothing further could, in the absence of other chronological indications, be inferred. The mention of the Passover feast might have been omitted, as well as other notes of time. But since nothing is found in the first Gospels which opposes the notion that Christ's ministry extended over more years than one; since it is improbable in itself, that it should have lasted but one year; and since even in Luke a passing remark occurs which necessarily assumes the intervention of a Passover during Christ's public ministry (the *σάββατον δευτέροπρωτον*, Luke vi., in combination with the ripe ears of corn); all this is in favour of John, who mentions the different Passovers. After further discussing this subject, Neander rightly remarks, 'If then it is to this Gospel alone that we are indebted for a chronologically arranged and practically connected representation of the public ministry of Jesus, a very favourable light is thus thrown upon its origin and historical character.' Wieseler completes this estimation of the Gospel of John by the remark, that Luke also offers several special and important dates; e.g., chap. ii. 1, 2, iii. 23, iii. 1, 2;

¹ On the data for the chronology of the life of Jesus, in St John's Gospel, by B. Jakobi, in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1831, No. 3.

² *Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 163 [Bohn's Ed.]

Acts i. 1, 3 : he consequently regards the two last Evangelists 'as peculiarly his guides and authorities' in his chronological investigations (*Chr. Syn.* p. 25).

The actual disparity between the three first Gospels and the fourth, must, besides the reasons already offered, be referred especially to the disparity between the circle of general evangelical tradition and the circle of John's reminiscences. When Christ attended the first Passover, He had not yet called the greater number of His apostles ; and this applies especially to Matthew. His four first disciples, however, had only entered upon their first close intercourse with Him, and did not become His assistants and companions till afterwards (comp. Matt. iv. 12, 18). Anything remarkable, therefore, that might have occurred at the first Passover, could not have been so vividly impressed upon the minds of those first disciples, as those subsequent events to which they were called to testify. The deep doctrinal transaction between Christ and Nicodemus must have been committed to the remembrance of His most confidential disciple by the Lord Himself. But the public purification of the temple, a circumstance widely known, and which the disciples would have heard of, was without difficulty inserted in the tradition of that Passover around which so many manifestations of Christ were concentrated ; and the more so, since a similar expression of Christ's displeasure at this old abuse probably recurred.¹ If Jesus, as we must suppose, went up to the second Passover, this visit was, on account of circumstances, strictly private. At the minor festivals, however, which He frequented, christological discussions, of which most of the disciples had then no mature appreciation, arose between Himself and the Jews ; John alone was capable of preserving their profound matter, by the power of his love and anticipative penetration. The interval between the first and third Passover was, on the contrary, chiefly filled up by the popular ministry of Christ in Galilee ; and hence it was this ministry which formed the chief material of the reminiscences of most of the disciples. It is probable that at the commencement of Christ's last ministry in Judea and Jerusalem, He was accompanied only by some and not by all His disciples ; while during the subsequent trying days before the crisis, most of them were so excited and agitated, that it was only upon so calm and profound a mind as John's that incidents of such a kind as the high-priestly prayer would make an accurate impression. And though John lived in continual intercourse with the other disciples, yet the psychical preponderance of the majority could not but decidedly influence the prevailing form of apostolical tradition. If, finally, we accept the view, that John afterwards found a delineation of this tradition in existence, it follows that he would feel all the greater impulse to write that which was peculiarly his own. He was, besides, one of those disciples of the Baptist, whose hearts had kindled towards the Saviour after His baptism, through the testimony of the Bap-

¹ [It will be seen below that the author decidedly favours this latter view.—ED.]

tist, and the manifestation of His own glory. Of what occurred at this period, he had the most vivid remembrance (John i. 35, &c.) He had also special connections in Jerusalem. It is probable that an attempt was at one time made, on the part of the high priest's family, to get information from him with respect to his Master; and that his pure and childlike spirit had withstood the temptation, without coming to an open rupture. Hence he best understood the nature of the conflict at Jerusalem. His turn, too, for religious speculation specially fitted him to preserve and give a form to the strictly christological discussions between Christ and His enemies. It was thus that the difference originated between the sphere of his reminiscences and that of the general evangelical tradition.

It will result from our statement, that the material of the three first Evangelists unites harmoniously with the chronological plan of John's narrative, into one rich whole.

But if the Gospel of John is made the foundation of our delineation with respect to the ministry of Christ, everything will depend upon clearing up the one uncertain point in the midst of it, viz., as to what feast of the Jews is intended in chap. v. 1.¹ Every possible Jewish festival has been supposed to be intended by these words. But the question has been more and more reduced to the alternative, that either the Passover or the feast of Purim must be the one alluded to.² For Jesus returned before attending this festival (most probably at seed-time, according to John iv. 35), after His first long sojourn in Judea, through Samaria to Galilee, perhaps about November or December. At this time both the feasts of Pentecost and Tabernacles would be already past. The feast of the Dedication of the Temple (*έγκαίνια*), however, which was celebrated in the month of December (from the 25th of the month Chislev), was too near to have left sufficient time between the return to Galilee and this festival for the lengthened ministry in Galilee, which took place in the interval. Consequently, either the feast of Purim, or the Passover of the succeeding spring, must be intended. If, then, this is the alternative to be decided on, the difference between the readings, *η ἑορτὴ τῶν Ιουδαίων* and *ἑορτή,*

¹ For exegetical discussions, comp. Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 211, and Lücke's *Commentar in loc.*

² The feast of Purim, or the feast of Lots (comp. Esth. ix.), in remembrance of the great change of lots, one of which, according to Haman's design, was to bring about the destruction of Israel, the other of which, according to God's counsel, brought a ruinous retribution upon him and the enemies of Israel in general, was celebrated on the fourteenth and fifteenth of the month Adar, which immediately preceded the paschal month, Nisan. [See Hengstenberg's *Christology*, iii. 241. The character of the feast of Purim has been urged, and not without reason, against the likelihood of Jesus being present at it. 'This much is certain, it hath had the effect, which mere human institutions in matters of religion very commonly have, to occasion corruption and licentiousness of manners, rather than to promote piety and virtue. The Jews . . . make it a sort of rule of their religion to drink till they can no longer distinguish between the blessing of Mordecai and the cursing of Haman. Insomuch that Archbishop Usher styles the feast of Purim the Bacchanalia of the Jews.' Jennings's *Jewish Antiquities*, p. 544.—ED.]

&c., without the article, is of the utmost importance. If the reading with the article is correct, and consequently the feast of the Jews simply is intended, the preference must be absolutely given to the Passover over the feast of Purim. We should then, indeed, be forced to interpose between this Passover and that mentioned chap. vi. 4, a whole year which would be entirely barren of events. But since the reading with the article is considered ungenuine by the oldest and most important evidence (comp. Lücke and Wieseler¹), the want of the article alone would incline us to the opposite view. For if merely *a* feast is spoken of, we should naturally conclude that one of the minor ones was intended. And when, finally, in connection with this notice, the Passover is immediately afterwards spoken of as nigh, we cannot but infer that the feast which was so near to the Passover, and preceded it with so little prominence, could be none other than the feast of Purim. This view is, after the precedent of Kepler, supported by Petavius, Tholuck, Olshausen, Neander, Krabbe, Winer, Jakobi, Ebrard, Wieseler, and others.² It will be seen hereafter how well it accords with the inward connection of facts in the Lord's life.

Hence the public ministry of Christ was exercised, almost entirely, during the space of two years; a period including three Passovers,—the time of the first preparation for His public appearance alone, preceding the first Passover. The whole series of events, however, which this interval embraces, cannot be divided according to the several Passovers, since these occur partly in the midst of certain stages of the Gospel history, while the feast of Purim (John v.), on the contrary, forms a decided turning-point of relations. For till this feast, the enthusiasm with which the Jewish people first welcomed Christ still prevailed, and His ministry was, in spite of sundry gentle warnings, restrictions, and isolated attacks, an uninterrupted and public one. But at this feast a decided collision took place between Christ and the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. From this time forth 'the Jews' persecuted, and sought to kill Him (John v. 16, comp. John vii. 13, 19, 21–23, 25). It was only occasionally, and when protected by the astonished multitude, that Jesus could henceforth freely appear among the people, being obliged, for the most part, to withdraw into Galilee, and subsequently into Perea, while even in these regions He was ever so involved in fresh conflicts with the excited pharisaic spirit, as to be continually obliged to change His place of sojourn by flight; now appearing in a district, and again as quickly disappearing from it. This period lasts till the time of His journey to His last Passover, when, with the knowledge that the crisis is now at hand, He appeared freely in public, surrendering Himself both to the homage of the people, and to His own trial. Having made these remarks, we may now proceed to define the separate periods of Christ's life.

¹ [Tischendorf, however, retains the article.—Ed.]

² [For a full statement of opinions and discussion of the question, see Greswell's *Dissertations*, ii., Dis. xxiii.; or Andrews' *Life of our Lord*, pp. 155–162.—Ed.]

NOTES.

1. Even the difference which is felt to exist between the teaching of Jesus in John and the synoptists, may be explained by the reasons given above for the difference of their selection of facts. When Jesus delivered those discourses to the multitudes, which the synoptists so delight to relate, parables and apophthegms were quite in place. When, on the contrary, He entered into those discussions with His adversaries, the chief points of which are given by John, this form of instruction was but partially applicable. A second explanation lies in the fact, that the three first Evangelists had, for the most part, anticipated the fourth in delivering this most comprehensible kind of instruction, namely, the parabolic and sententious; and that it also was part of the peculiarity of John, from the first, to appropriate the symbolic and speculative elements of Christ's teaching. We may finally remark, that in John, as well as in the synoptists, the direct didactic form is not wanting in the parabolic discourses. Comp. Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte*, p. 312, &c.

2. It by no means follows from the circumstance, that the several synoptical Evangelists do not relate the events of the Gospel history in direct chronological sequence, that they pay no regard to the great leading chronological features. Nay, even in those very groupings of the several occurrences which depend upon actual or traditional motives, they undoubtedly form single groups according to chronological sequence. Ebrard distinguishes in this respect p. 65, &c.) between 'chains' and 'syndesms.' By the former he understands a series of consecutive, interdependent events; by the latter, a definite concatenation of such *chains*.

3. Weisse expresses (*Ev. Gesch.* i. 292) the opinion, that we need for the public teaching of Christ, 'a period of not too small a series of years.' In this view he opposes the authority of the fourth Evangelist, and appeals to the authority of Irenæus, who, 'makes the most celebrated events in the life of Jesus take place between His fortieth and fiftieth years.' Irenæus, however, specially supported this statement by the passage, John viii. 57, in which the Jews remark to Jesus, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old.' According then to this author, we are to attach more credit to the fourth Gospel through the intervention of Irenæus, *i.e.*, to an arbitrary interpretation of it by Irenæus, than to the same fourth Gospel itself, in its direct chronological statements. With respect also to the locality of Christ's ministry, Weisse sets himself in direct opposition to the fourth Gospel, 'which relates repeated visits to the festivals at Jerusalem' (p. 293). The custom of journeying to the feasts is said to have no longer been so general in the days of Christ, as in the early and simpler times of the Jewish nation (p. 306). 'So slavish a subjection to the ceremonial law as must be assumed to necessitate these journeys to the feasts,' it is further said, 'is opposed to all church-doctrinal views of the dignity of the Messiah.'

Jesus is therefore said to have 'probably laboured many years' in Galilee, without frequenting any feasts, and then perhaps at length influenced by the perception that His miraculous power was declining (p. 431), to have seized the resolution, and uttered the great saying, that He must go up to Jerusalem to be delivered up to His enemies, to be ill-used and put to death by them. This hypothesis gives a monstrous representation of the personality and agency of Jesus. Only imagine a prophet of Israel absenting himself for years from the great feasts of his nation, and yet maintaining his prophetic credit in the eyes of the people journeying to the feasts; a Saviour remaining in isolated Galilee, while the people were thronging to Jerusalem; a reformer of the theocracy entering the external centre of this theocracy only at the end of his course, and to die! Not only would the religious, but even the moral feeling of the people of Galilee have rejected Him; for visits to the feasts were in their eyes not only a religious, but a civil duty, a sacred national custom.¹ According to this hypothesis, Christ's journey to Jerusalem to die there, was but an act of fanatical caprice. The assumption that Christ must have considered these visits to the festivals a slavish subjection to the ceremonial law, deserves no discussion. Besides, the critic is not only in opposition to St John, but also to the synoptists (comp. Matt. xxiii. 37, xxvii. 58).²

4. The Gospel of St John clears up the chronological obscurities of the three first Gospels. After the miracle which Jesus performed on the Sabbath, according to John v., the Jewish party at Jerusalem began to persecute Him. The retirement which the Lord from this time observed, for the sake of obtaining time sufficient for the completion of His ministry, was probably the cause of His attending the next Passover in private, and unattended by His disciples (chap. vi. 4), but not of His avoiding it. One consequence of this was, that this chronological period, as well as the first Passover, escaped most of His disciples, because they were then not yet among his followers.³

¹ Comp. G. Schweitzer, *der Christenglanbe an Jesum von Nazareth*, p. 319. According to Weisse, p. 296, Mark, in the passage chap. xi. 11, is said to represent Jesus, 'who had just entered Jerusalem, as looking around Him on all things in the temple, as one would do to whom all was still new and strange.' Just perhaps like some aged Catholic countryman who comes for the first time to Cologne, and, after looking at the cathedral with astonishment, departs on his business.

² [A full account of the literature on the duration of our Lord's ministry is given in Marsh's *Michaelsis*, vol. iii. Pt. 2, pp. 56-67.—ED.]

³ [A list of harmonies is given by Marsh in the above-cited work, but it is both too full for practical purposes, and also composed mainly of works which are now superseded. Upwards of 150 are collected by Hase (*Leben Jesu*, p. 21, ed. 1854), though the works of Stroud, Greswell, and Robinson are all omitted from this list. Selected lists are given by Tischendorf in his own very valuable and accessible *Synopsis Evangelica* (Lips. 1854); and by Ellicott in his *Historical Lectures*, &c., p. 15, note. The great principles of harmony are laid down by Michaelis (iii. 14), but are expressed in a more concise, scientific, and trustworthy manner by Ebrard (p. 57, &c.).—ED.]

SECTION II.

THE PERIODS OF CHRIST'S LIFE.

A delineation of the facts of Christ's life owes it to that great and world-famed subject whereof it treats, that it should view it not only in its internal, but also in its external connection, and therefore according to the causes and effects by which it is linked with the world's history, and forms its central point. In the present work, indeed, the actual delineation of the life of Jesus forms only the middle division of a more comprehensive treatment of the subject, according to the plan of which, the general causes and effects of Christ's life in the world's history had to be discussed in the first division. The more immediate relations, however, by which this life was connected with the history of mankind, must be brought forward together with the facts of His life. The history of this life will therefore commence with a description of that period of universal history during which Christ laboured ; we must see the scene upon which He lived and worked. At the close of this life, too, we must obtain a general view of His agency and influence upon mankind. These two examinations, as prologue and epilogue, together with our delineation of the life of Jesus, will form a whole, which would thus cause this Second Book to consist of three parts, besides the Introduction. The several periods, however, of the life itself are of such importance, that they must be treated as chief divisions or 'parts' of the whole book, if its contents are to be developed in just and regular proportions.

The First Part, then, will present the historical sphere of Christ's life, and describe the relations of time and place by which He was surrounded. The several periods of His life will follow : the history of His childhood ; the preparations for his public appearance in Israel ; the time of His free agency amidst the enthusiastic welcome of His countrymen ; the conflicts between Christ and the corrupt national spirit of the Jews, causing the Lord to observe a holy retirement ; the last decided surrender of Christ to the enthusiasm of His people ; the treachery of His people, which brought about His condemnation at the world's bar, and His death upon the cross ; and finally, the manifestation of His glory in His resurrection and ascension. Thus the periods of Christ's life form our next seven parts. The ninth and last will conclude the work with a retrospect of His life ; depicting, first, His whole manifestation to, and influence upon mankind ; and finally, the enduring effect of His life.¹

¹ Wieseler comprises the events from the public appearance of John the Baptist till the feast of Purim, John v., in one section, and His journey to the feast of Tabernacles in another section (*Synopse*, p. 31). His division displays an intimate acquaintance with the subject. Many more recent divisions testify to the despair of their authors, in their attempt to discover the connection of the Gospel history.

PART I.

THE HISTORICAL SPHERE OF CHRIST'S LIFE.

SECTION I.

THE RELATIONS OF TIME AND PLACE AMONG WHICH CHRIST APPEARED.

IT was as a prophet of Israel that Christ entered upon His public ministry ; His abode was in an inconsiderable district of the Jewish land ; His age was coincident with about the middle of that of the first Roman emperors. With respect to the ordinary view of the circumstances of the world, He lived, as far as locality is concerned, in a corner of the world, and, as far as time is concerned, in the midst of a great period. With respect, however, to the proper and actual view of the circumstances of the world, His appearance constituted the fulness of time. The pre-christian development of mankind came to a close with Him ; the æon of the ancient times was ended. The maturity of the ancient times was manifested by great points of union in its several tendencies, and altogether became, by the strictest inward relations, one great unity, in which the significance of the time was concentrated. In the life of Jesus, all the powers of the world concurred to bring about the catastrophe which was at once the world's condemnation and deliverance.

In Christ Himself was perfected the development of the true lineage of humanity, of the sacred commerce between heaven and earth, or of the christological life. Heavenly humanity appeared in the Son of man in its concentration, in its personal unity, filled with the quickening Spirit, and in this divine fulness, mighty to save. Thus did Christ appear as the honour and climax of human nature, its positive unity and holiness.

But the appearance of this positive unity was met by its negative ; viz., by the fact that humanity, as a whole, had now come to a state of mature receptivity. Humanity had now become a world (*oikouμένη*) both needing, and capable of, redemption ; a world united in government, civilization, and language ; in preparedness for the manifestation of God in the flesh ; in religious knowledge and expectation ; by the exigencies of ruin, by despair, by yearning and desire, had the gates been widened, and the world's door

thrown open for the King of glory to come in. The earthly glory of Judaism had decayed, and its best instruments were therefore capable of understanding and accepting the Messiah of a spiritual world, the King of the kingdom of truth. The heathen world, on the contrary, was, through some of its noblest sons, the proselytes of the gate and of righteousness, everywhere acquainted with the actual historical Monotheism of the synagogue,¹ which must be well distinguished from heathen abstract Monotheism—a Monotheism merely philosophical in its tenets, and cowardly in its utterances—and had reached just that frame of mind in which only the highest, the ultimate word of this Monotheism, the Gospel, was wanting. This unity, which we, according to the analogy of polar relations, designate negative, corresponded with the positive unity: the fulness of life, and the life to be filled, the positive and negative pleroma (John i. 16; Eph. i. 23), were mutually present; hence the fulness of the time was come, the beginning of the marriage festival, in which the union of the Lord with His Church is to take place.

The incarnation of the Son of God and the glorification of humanity did not, however, take place among a sinless generation, but in a world fallen and degenerate. Hence this manifestation could only be effected under the grave form of redemption, the redemption only under the terrible form of a sentence of death. The concentration of light was encountered by the concentration of darkness; and as, on the one side, the Holy One of Israel united with the world's receptivity, so, on the other side, did the corrupt external pietism of Israel, which ripened into obduracy in presence of the actual holiness of Christ, unite with the corruption of the heathen world, which had now attained its climax, in the resolution to reject Him, and therefore in the guilt by which the unbelieving world condemned itself. It was not till this sentence was passed, that Christ could be perfected as the Redeemer of such a world (Heb. ii. 10), or the world become capable of receiving such a Redeemer (Gal. vi. 14).

The corruption of the spurious, externalized piety among that chosen nation, whose external aspect had symbolically represented, and whose inmost nature had actually represented, the positive pole of the manifestation, appears in the fact, that in the greater number of its members, the pretension to external holiness was most decidedly prominent where there was most lack of it internally. But the spuriousness of this pretension, and the completeness of the corruption therein manifested, were displayed in the three forms it assumed, which, as separate parties, were utterly at variance with each other. The most respected and dominant sect

¹ [The leavening of the heathen world by Jewish influences, the condition of the Jewish people themselves, and the prevalent expectation of a Messiah, are excellently treated by Ewald (*Geschichte Christus und seiner Zeit*, p. 55, &c., 2d ed.). And besides the Church histories, see on these same points Bishop Blomfield's *Traditional Knowledge of a Promised Redeemer*. Much also may be learnt from Trench's exquisite *Hulscar Lectures on Christ the Desire of all nations*.—ED.]

was that of the Pharisees, the casuistic and trifling interpreters of the law; their holiness consisted chiefly in that rank over-growth of precepts and observances with which they stifled and corrupted revelation. They were strangers to the spiritual character of Old Testament Christology; the increase of forms and observances was to them in the place of the increase of life; while the reform or criticism of their traditions was an abomination to them. But while the Pharisees designated the whole mass of legal tradition in Israel as sacred, the Sadducees left to the Old Testament development of revelation only its first beginnings; their holiness consisted in converting the Mosaic law into a final, deistic, moral law, and boasted of righteousness in an observance of this mutilation of it. Thus they misconceived the development of the theocratic seed exhibited in the prophets, and deadened the germinating power and vitality of the Mosaic law itself by their view of it; their standpoint being the miserable one of an abstract negation. Besides these corruptions, which may be distinguished, the one as an adding to, the other as a taking from revelation, there was but a third possible, namely, its alteration. This was represented in the system of the Essenes, who sought their holiness in separating the spiritual elements of the theocracy from their true connection, and exhibiting them mingled with heathen notions, in an unreal, highly incorporeal, and devoted life. In their abhorrence of the concrete, they sacrificed all that was corporeal and social in revelation to a spiritualistic separatism, which is always skilful in exhibiting isolated breathings and ideas of the divine life in special dedications and exercises, but can never attain to the dedication of the whole actual life, because it is its property to condemn the universality of revelation in the popular Church of God. The first of these sects ruled, according to their own peculiar notions, over the superstition of the nation, and its external worship; the second, as a cowardly element of scepticism, manifested both in the opinions and by the reserve of the upper classes, pervaded the theocratic government with dismal effect; the third lived in voluntary excommunication, which it sought to palliate by a pacifying demeanour towards the sacred rites of the people. It is quite in accordance with the character of these sects, that the Pharisees should especially urge on the crucifixion of Christ, that the Sadducees should seek to suppress the announcement of His resurrection; while the Essenes kept as far aloof from the scene and events of Christ's life as if they had not existed, on which account they are never met with as active agents in the Gospel narrative.

The corrupt pietism of Israel was quite prepared, under these three forms, to misconceive the true glory of Israel, the Messiah, and either to reject Him or expose Him to the heathen, nay, to deliver Him up to the jurisdiction of the heathen world.

The maturity of heathen corruption is evidenced by the fact, that the Romish power was capable, at the instance of Jewish fanaticism, of perpetrating, under the forms of their proud and

perfected administration of justice, that great 'judicial murder' against the person of Christ. Pilate, the powerful representative of the Roman Emperor and of the civilization of his universal dominion, suffers himself to bend, to crack, to break, in his three-fold capacity of ruler, judge, and philosopher, before the storm of Jewish fanaticism. The power of the Roman eagle becomes subservient to the fury of a conquered and hated people; the venerable and exalted Roman Forum passes sentence of death upon acknowledged innocence; the aristocratic and ironical philosopher, who penetrates the motives of Christ's enemies, and smiles at His doctrine as an inoffensive and harmless enthusiasm, lowers himself through fear of the people into the executioner of fanaticism. Pilate, however, does not thus stand before us merely as an individual, he represents the secular spirit of his times; and his soldiers, by their active co-operation in the crucifixion, express the savage temper of those legions which conquered and governed the world. Thus an alliance of hierarchy, despotism, and revolution, the latter being represented by the Jewish people, together with an alliance of superstition and unbelief in the Pharisees and Sadducees, took place at the crucifixion of Christ, in which the union of the world in its enmity against Christ, was announced in a world-famed and decisive incident. As however that world of light which is opposed to this world of darkness, manifests its life in its contrasted positive and negative poles, so do we perceive in this alliance also, the contrast of positive Jewish hatred, and negative heathen irresolution, through whose union that condemnation of Christ, which condemned the whole world, took place.

Since, however, in Christ perfect love exists in presence of the world's complete banded hatred, a struggle necessarily ensues, in which love is outwardly subdued, but inwardly victorious. The world is condemned while it is saved; its entire ruin is evidenced in the fact it accomplishes; it rejects its own honour, its glory, by rejecting Christ. Thus it is outdone and convicted by the justice of God; it loses its right to live and to boast of eternal righteousness. But the same world is saved while it is condemned; this its extremity of guilt renders its need of salvation complete, and its salvation is perfected by the victory of love in its innocent faithful Head and Saviour. The victory of Christ's love over the world's enmity is the victory of God's grace over the curse.

Thus did Christ enter the midst of the world and of time, and lay the foundation of a new æon surpassing the old time, or rather He founded this new æon upon the old time. The reception of His Gospel is the beginning of eternal (æonian) life, its rejection the beginning of eternal misery. Hence the forces which concurred in bringing about the holy catastrophe of the Gospel are continually reappearing in the great constellations of the world's history; the same forms, the same contrasts, in ever-increasing approaches to universality and maturity, till at length the perfect universality of the last struggle between light and darkness, cannot but introduce the end of the world's career.

NOTES.

1. The Cross of Christ symbolically denotes the central point of this world and of time, towards which all the contrasts of the world converge, to terminate the ancient forms of their agency and to develop themselves again under new ones. The world confronts the one Christ as a concentrated unity ; the Jews and the Romans, the representatives of all religious and secular culture, all ranks and conditions, hierarchy, monarchy, democracy, were united in the coalition which perpetrated the crucifixion, as well as all human sins, all the bad passions of mankind, and all unclean spirits. This contrast—Christ in the power of light, the world under the power of darkness—expresses indeed the mightiest struggle, the most decided dualism. The true unity, however, which this incident produced, is that of the providential government of God and the heart of Christ,—the providential government of God, which, by the doom of crucifixion, brought to perfection, in the very heat of the battle, the redeeming work of Christ, and the need of redemption on the part of man ; the heart of Christ, in which love, as infinite love to the world, endured with infinite compassion the world's condemnation, and as infinite love to the Father, welcomed and grasped in this sentence both deliverance and reconciliation. But out of this unity arises a new contrast ; the Crucified One, who gives Himself to the believing world as its Saviour, is to the unbelieving world a sign of condemnation. In this great event are seen all the great powers of the world in their most powerful state of excitement. Israel is divided into the crucifying people, and the crucified Lord. Israel delivers Christ to the heathen. The whole world crucifies Him ; hence it appears as a world subdued by Heathenism. The true Israel, in its concentration and perfection in Christ alone, opposes it ; for the Jews who crucified Him were then, in a theocratic sense, heathens and nothing else ; nay, the last and worst among the heathen, since they had thus cast away their Israelite glory. The heathen, however, were no longer mere heathen, after Christ had been delivered up, and had delivered Himself up, to them by the surrender of love. The receptive among them now formed a unity together with the receptive of Israel ; nay, it was they who formed the majority of these receptive ones, and consequently formed also, by their reception of Christ, the people of His possession. Thus the parts played by Israel and the Gentiles in the world's history were changed ; the poles changed places with each other under the influence of the great storm—the first became last. This effect of the Cross expresses, on one side, the infinitely delicate interworking of all relations in the history of the world, and between heaven and earth ; on the other, the infinite intelligence of the overruling divine mind amidst the interworking of all these relations.

2. It is a defective view of the Jewish sects, to describe the Pharisees alone as the self-righteous among them, since they rather did but exhibit one special kind of self-righteousness, viz., the

casuistic, while the Sadducees were guilty of rationalistic, and the Essenes of spiritualistic, ascetic self-righteousness. In this respect the names of the several sects are significant. The name of the Pharisees, פְּרָשִׁים, is derived by Suidas from פָּרַשׁ in the sense of *to separate, to distinguish*, so that the Pharisees represent those who were distinguished from the other Jews by their holiness—set apart, pious ones (see Winer, *R. W. B.* ii. 290). But the title would, in this sense, be far more applicable to the Essenes than to the Pharisees, who lived specially among the people. If, however, we consider the general meaning of Pharisaism, we find that it exhibits exactly that bitter separatism in which corrupt Judaism appeared in the presence of Heathenism, and in its separation therefrom. Thus the Pharisees were, with respect to the heathen, those complete separatists which the Jews in general are said to have been, according to the assumption of rationalism, but which, as merely Israelites, they certainly were not. ‘This tendency,’ says Winer, ‘was probably first impressed upon them after the restoration of the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine (in the time of Ezra), and is properly the characteristic of exclusive Judaism, as distinguished from Hebraism. This disposition very naturally evoked another, viz., Sadduceeism. But certainly neither formed sects, properly so called, in an ecclesiastical or political sense, before the period of the native Jewish princes (the Maccabees). The effect of this pharisaic effort in presence of the heathen world was manifest, not only in the behaviour observed toward the heathen themselves, but also toward those who seemed to be infected by their blood and spirit, toward Samaritans and publicans. (Comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* xvii. 2, 4 and xviii. 1.) It may be questioned whether the word Pharisee may not be referred to act. Part. פֹּרֶשׁ, as others have conceived; the word פָּרַשׁ meaning actual separation, strict severance, subtle distinction. This expresses the relation in which the Pharisees stood to the law: they explained it as discriminating casuists, developing their precepts and observances from it. In any case, the Pharisees were self-righteous, or, to define them more clearly, observers of traditions and rites. The Sadducees also made pretensions to legal righteousness. Epiphanius (*Hæres.* i. 14) derives their name from the fact that they thus named themselves from a notion of possessing a righteousness corresponding to their view of the law (the law in its mutilation). If, however, the word cannot be directly derived from צָדִיק (righteous), but must first be referred to a *nomen proprium*, צָדִיק,¹ yet the relation between this noun and the adjective צָדִיק is unmistakeable, and must have been significant to a sect which boasted of fulfilling a pure and sharply defined law. The Sad-

¹ According to the explanation by which the Rabbis derived the word from Sadoc, a founder of this sect, who is said to have been a disciple of Antigonus Socho, whose instructor, Simeon the Just, lived in the time of Alexander the Great. [Antigonus was president of the Sanhedrim 300–260 years before Christ, and taught that God was to be served out of pure love, and not from fear of punishment or hope of reward, from which doctrine Sadoc concluded that there was no future world of retribution.—ED.]

ducees, then, were self-righteous in the sense of obedience to a revealed duty—rationalists seeking righteousness in duty. The Essenes, finally, sought to be righteous in the sense of entire severance from the common and profane, in virtue of strict devotedness, renunciation, and religious exercises, nay, even of inward devotedness. This pretension is evidenced in their whole mode of life, and expressed by their name, which is a mutilation of **חִסְדִּים** (**σύστοι**), the pious, the holy, and at all events denotes an internal as well as an external piety. Even this common characteristic of pretensions to holiness, expresses the alienation of these tendencies from Christianity. With respect to the Old Testament, however, they represent three separate kinds of corruption. The principle of outward piety which animates Pharisaism, poisons religion, and forces it into a wild and rank luxuriance of precepts and observances. The principle of doubt which governs Sadduceeism, not only cuts off prophecy, that noble plant of the theocracy, as a weed, but even kills its roots. The Thorah is to this school only a literal codex; hence it denies that the doctrine of the resurrection is contained therein, just as unspiritual rationalism is unable to discover it in the entire Old Testament. Thus Sadduceeism properly represents a belief in a mutilated revelation; while Essenism, on the other hand, represents an actual alteration of revelation. The relations of rank among its members are opposed to the institution of the Church of God; the legal celibacy of the majority, to the Old Testament consecration of marriage; aversion to anointing with oil, and avoidance of participation in the temple sacrifices (comp. Neander's *Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 40, note), denote a spiritualism which had overstepped connection with the theocracy (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8; Philo, *quod probus liber*). When the youthful education of Christ was formerly attributed to the Essenes, this was a proof that the true relation of this sect to the economy of the kingdom of God was not yet understood. Its morbid spiritualism points to dualistic assumptions, to heathen Gnostic elements, especially expressed in its view that the body is the prison of the soul (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 11). Consequently the relations of this tendency explain the fact, that it was idealized by Philo. Even the views of the three parties, respecting the relations between God and man, were one and all unchristological; all that happened being attributed by the Essenes to fate, by the Sadducees to human freedom, by the Pharisees partly to fate, partly to human freedom (Josephus, *Antiq.* xiii. 5, 9, and *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 14). That elements existed in each of these tendencies,—namely, piety in Pharisaism, a struggle for spiritual freedom in Sadduceeism, and the cultivation of the inner life in Essenism,—which in noble minds might lead to an alliance with Christianity, is not denied by what we have advanced.¹

¹ [According to Neander, the Sadducees were less likely to embrace Christianity than either of the other sects. For fuller information on the Jewish sects, see Drusius, *de tribus sectis Iudeorum*, which has been incorporated by Triglandius with other works on kindred subjects, and published in two vols. 4to. Delft, 1703.—ED.]

3. When Christ was born, Judea, though dependent upon Rome, had still a king of its own (Herod). When He was crucified, it had already been for some time under the government of the Romans, after the proscription of the ethnarch Archelaus, Pontius Pilate being the sixth governor who ruled over the country. According to ancient theocratic privileges, this subjection would have been but a temporary visitation. The delivering up, however, of Christ to the Gentiles extinguished the ancient theocratic rights of the nation. When the return of Israel to the faith, and their national restoration, are announced in our days, such an event is quite in conformity with the prophetic promise ; but when the reinstatement of the nation in its ancient privileges in the kingdom of God is promised, this is entirely opposed, not only to the priesthood of the universal Church of Christ over all nations, but also to the fact that the hereditary theocratic rights of Israel were forfeited by the crucifixion of Christ.

4. On the notion of the æon, compare the work, *Unsere Unsterblichkeit, und der Weg zu derselben*, Kempten, Dannheimer 1836, p. 12. ‘Æon or eternity is not that which has no end and no beginning. Æon is nature returning in its vital movement from hidden beginnings to developments also hidden.’—‘Æon is the inward period of development of things, the inward time of things.’

SECTION II.

THE SCENE OF CHRIST'S LIFE, THE PROMISED LAND.

It was not till His crucifixion that Jesus was released from the obligation by which, as the most loyal Israelite, He felt His personal ministry confined to His own people (John x. 16, xii. 32 ; Matt. xv. 24), though that spiritual fulness and inward freedom with which He lived within the prescribed limits of Israel, made His life a ministry supremely adapted to the wants of the whole world (Matt. xiii. 31 ; John xii. 23, 24). Hence the great, the essential, and therefore the eternal King of the whole human race, completed His course and His work within the narrow boundaries of the promised land, the Israelite Canaan.

As the nation of Israel may, according to the compass of its powers and deficiencies, its light and dark sides, be regarded as a concentrated representation of the human race, so may the promised land be designated a symbolical miniature of the whole earth. It represents the essential peculiarities of the earth in the smallest space, and within the smallest frame ; hence it has become the beloved, the ‘precious’ land, the land that speaks to man’s heart, the land by which man has learnt to appreciate the beauty of the whole earth. Hence, also, is it that the Jew, in his exile, finds that the whole earth is his home ; while, at the same time, he never feels himself at home anywhere. A grave in the much-longed-for promised land is the object of his utmost desire.

Canaan unites within itself a rich variety of most significant contrasts, by the blending of which is formed that unity, the chosen

land, which was destined to be the place of education for the chosen people. As little as Israel, with its theocratic and divine blessings, was destined to isolate itself, with respect to other nations, by a bitter and pharisaic pietism, so little was Canaan shut up from the world. It lay midway between the most polished nations of Asia, Africa, and Europe; landwards, it was either bounded or traversed by the most famous caravan roads; seawards, it was in the neighbourhood of the most frequented sea-passages, and the most noted navigators. Surrounded by numerous nations, in the neighbourhood of the world-blessing Phœnicians, of the world-conquering Assyrians, and of the world-frequented Egyptians; exposed to being involved in all the great catastrophes of the heathen world; the land could not but experience every pulsation of the world's life, nor could its people fail to retain the feeling of the effort in which its destination for the world, the consciousness that its theocratic blessing was destined for the world, was to ripen. Its very position would continually give Israel occasion to appreciate and maintain the power of its faith contrasted with the secular power of Babylon—the light of its Monotheism contrasted with the learning of Egypt—its quiet, happy, festal life contrasted with the splendour of Phœnicia, nay, its own inward worth, its own reality carried to appearance, contrasted with the plastic 'appearance carried to reality' of the Grecian world.¹ But as Canaan lay, on the one hand, in the neighbourhood of all the powers of the world, so was it, on the other hand, isolated by the peculiarities of its position; and fulfilled thereby its destination to become a retreat for Israel's youthful consciousness, which could only attain its maturity of monotheistic development through the sharp thorns and goads which its attitude of variance towards other nations produced. That measure of divinely ordained, temporary, universal pietism, protected by which Israelitish knowledge of God was to come to maturity, found its corresponding limit in the geographical enclosure of the land: the Lebanon, the Syrian wilderness, the desert boundaries towards Egypt, the neighbourhood of the ever-jealous Philistines,—all these limits were a help to the weakness of a people ever alternating between the extremes of a boundless wooing and an equal hatred of the world, while its duty was both to preserve the noble seed of the world's true freedom, and to cherish the most ardent love for the world.² Even the very conformation of the earth on which lay the sacred localities, seemed to share in the destiny of the country. It was such that the country could everywhere be easily fortified.

¹ In the time of Christ this contact of Israel with the heathen was already fixed in various ways. The Samaritans were of old a mingled people, infected with heathen elements; Galilee, by its neighbourhood to Gentile nations, its mingling with the remnants of Gentile tribes, and by its intercourse with the Gentiles who traversed it upon the great caravan roads, had become 'Galilee of the Gentiles,' according to the strictly Jewish feeling. Jerusalem itself, as a place of pilgrimage to all Jews and proselytes, could not but favour the ever increasing numbers of converted heathen.

² Comp. Bräm, *Beschreibung des h. Landes*, p. 3; *Geographie des Menschen von Fr. v. Rougemont*, tr. by Hugendubel, p. 159.

Jerusalem is almost a natural fortification ; the coast is protected by noble heights, Gerizim and Tabor seem raised like citadels ; even in the lesser features and details in the formation of this glorious land, adaptability to purposes of fortification, and fitness to become the abode of a sacred spirit of kindliness, is everywhere manifested.¹ From Lebanon downwards towards Egypt the chalk formation is continued in a series of hills and mountains, which offer rude clefts and mountain fastnesses for the retreat of an oppressed people² (*Judg. vi. 2*), and especially for persecuted prophets (*1 Kings xviii. 4*) and royal fugitives (*1 Sam. xxii.*), among which the caves upon Carmel, particularly that attributed to Elijah, as well as David's cave at Adullam, are specially celebrated. Besides this series of white rocks, a vein of black basalt runs through the eastern borders of the country, and indicates the subterranean fire which formed the region, and probably played its part in the earlier theocratic and miraculous history of the people.³ From north to south, and from east to west, the greatest variety is met with in the conformation of the country. From the tract of coast in the west we ascend to the hill country, with its terrace-like formations, divided into two parts by the deep valley of the Jordan, the eastern hills being bounded by the great desert. From north to south chains of hills run through the country on either side of the Jordan, as if they would bury it in more sacred and silent solitude,⁴ and crown the solitary inheritance of 'the silent one' with heights and peaks, between whose openings are obtained, in some parts, views of the sea, but generally of the distant country. How rich is this country in glorious and charming prospects from hill to hill—southwards from the hills of Naphtali to the hills of Ephraim, and from these to the hills of Judah, but especially between the heights of the eastern and western sides of Jordan ! There are regions which address the human spirit, so to speak, in the major tone, e.g., extensive plains of mountain scenery. Others speak in a minor key to the mind. Germany is rich in minor tones. Canaan, however, seems to have a great variety of transitions from one to the other, and yet to possess a strongly marked unity of character. In its eastern highlands it exhibits the Asiatic characteristic of monotonous vastness ; in its western formation of hills and valleys are seen touches

¹ Comp. Plieninger's *Weinachtsblüthen* for 1838, p. 201.

² To the present day the mountainous region of Lebanon has been the resort of free tribes, or of Christian flocks, though they have not been able to deliver themselves from the Mohammedan power.

³ 'The volcanic nature of the basin of this lake (the Sea of Galilee), and of the surrounding region, is not to be mistaken. The hot springs near Tiberias and at Umkeis, S.E. of the lake, as also the lukewarm springs along its western shore, the frequent and violent earthquakes, and the black basaltic stones which thickly strew the ground, all leave no room for doubt on this point.' Robinson, ii. 416.* S. Crowe, *Geographisch-historische Beschreibung des Landes Palästina*, Pt. i. p. 34.

⁴ 'From our calculations, soon afterwards confirmed by many observers, we unexpectedly found that the plain of Jordan is 528 Parisian feet below the level of the sea.' Schubert's *Reise*, iii. 80.

* [All the references in this work to Robinson's *Researches in Palestine* are made to the second edition, London 1856, 3 vols.—ED.]

of its affinity to Europe;¹ towards the south are reflected Egypt and Africa, in the glaring contrasts it presents of both paradisaic and terrible scenes; towards the north the mountainous district of Lebanon forms the boundary of the land. The white peak of Hermon, seen far through the country, represents the regions of eternal winter; while in the low-lying tracts of the valley of Jordan the palm, the pride of tropical regions, revels in the hot climate of Arabia. How extensive is the scale of climatal contrasts in this land!² And what a happy medium exists in those warm boundaries of the temperate zone, in which it is easiest to man to maintain the due proportion between labour and rest, in which, in the pleasant contrast of their alternation, both light and darkness could be called gifts of God, and looked upon as welcome blessings!³ With the pleasant occupations of rural life between seed-time and harvest, was intermixed the romantic feature of nomade life, and the anchorite's freedom from care for supplies was experienced within the sphere of pastoral life; while the domestic comforts of Western life were here met with, on the very boundaries of the desert, and of the torrid zone. The Israelite could often pass both night and day in the open air, but not without experiencing the excitement which man always feels in the romantic wildernesses of the earth. He was surrounded by the kindly sights and sounds of nature;⁴ but the sublime was everywhere the predominating element. His country was rich in enjoyments, but exposed to the vicissitudes of great natural catastrophes. The sharp contrast between oasis and desert, between the soil of the aromatic and variegated palm, and the naked, burning, sandy rock of Arabia, is found here; e.g., in the contrasts between the frightful rocky wilderness of Quarantania and the blooming gardens of Jericho,⁵ and especially between the fertile borders of the Lake of Galilee and the desert shores of the Dead Sea.⁶ These contrasts point to the delicate and spiritual nature of the country, to its delicate suspension on the line between the blessing and the curse (Deut. xi. 28). Canaan was from the first a country infinitely susceptible of changes of condition, like the people, with which it was to form a sanctuary for God. It

¹ Fr. von Rougemont, *Geogr. des Menschen*, i. 158.

² 'The Arabs say of Lebanon, that winter rests upon its head, spring sports on its shoulders, autumn lies on its lap, and summer slumbers at its feet.'—*Biblische Geographie*, Calw. 1643 (von Barth), p. 3. 'In Jericho the wheat harvest was nearly over by the 14th of May, while here, in Tiberias, it was in about the same state of advance only on the 19th of June.'—Robinson, ii. 388.

³ Isa. ix. 2; Mal. iv. 2; Ps. xvii. 8, xci. 1.

⁴ 'Besides the exotics of the warmer East, willows and poplars, as well as the tamarisk, flourish there; and among the songs of other minstrels of the wood, whose tones are strange to the ear, may be heard the familiar lay of the nightingale.'—Schubert, *Ueber die Gegend von Jericho* (vol. iii. 84). 'The western shore of the northern part of the lake, before and beyond El Medjel (Magdala), is extremely fertile, and covered, down to the water's edge, with corn-fields, interspersed with thickets and trees. It seems to be a favourite haunt of wood-pigeons and turtle-doves: we saw them by hundreds, and heard their cooings.'—*Id.* p. 250.

⁵ See Schubert's *Reise in das Morgenland*, vol. iii. pp. 72-77.

⁶ We do not here speak of the regions surrounding these two seas. Ancient prejudices concerning them have been corrected by modern travellers.

lies midway between those great natural extremes, in which the earth seems almost to overpower man, as, *e.g.*, in the heat and luxuriance of the East Indies, and in the frozen deserts of Greenland. Regions of this kind have either a paralyzing or an intoxicating effect upon sinful man, favouring in either case the dreams of sensual life. Canaan, on the contrary, shares the lot of its inhabitants, as if it sympathized in it, as the harp does with the feelings of its player. The reason lies in the changeable and delicate tone of the climate and soil. Both are in the highest degree influenced by vegetation. Vegetation, however, in Canaan presupposes a peaceful, numerous, industrious, and pious people. What is more or less true of the earth in general, is especially so of Canaan—that the country deteriorates and improves with the people¹ (*Isa. xiii. 11, &c., xxiv., xxx. 23*, and other passages).

This country could be changed into a garden, and it was a garden at its best times. The hills of terrace-like form were often changed into terraces. On these happy hills the joy of harvest was ever resounding; on these pastures the shepherd was ever rejoicing. But when Israel forsook God, they became the prey of the nations whose gods they worshipped. The good land was trodden down, and became a road for the enemy, disgraced, stripped of its foliage, and converted into a sun-burnt stony field, neglected, and in its desolation often overgrown with thorns. The varying soil of the human heart, the bad reception given by many to the seed of the divine word, was reflected in the desolation of the land (*Matt. xiii. 3*).

The Old Testament must be read to perceive how easily the country influenced its people, how well the people understood their country. This land is related to the highest problems and destinies of humanity; there is a constant interaction between the countenance of man and the face of the country. This theocratic and poetic consecration of the wells and springs, of the caves and hills of Israel—the gleams of the blessing, the shadows of the curse, which are interwoven into the whole country, but especially the perpetual fragrance of that christological consecration which hovers over the summits of the hills surrounding the Sea of Galilee, and of the Mount of Olives,—every part of the Holy Land is an enduring testimony to the fact, that in Israel human nature was awakened and developed, in interaction with the promised land, to that state of mind which understands the ideal nature of the earth, its deep harmony with mankind.

Canaan received its highest consecration from the journeyings of Christ. As the loyal Israelite, dwelling first at Nazareth and then at Capernaum, Christ had to make the customary journeys to the sacred feasts at Jerusalem. As their Rabbi, He shared in the

¹ A fact utterly ignored by those critics who insist on drawing from the barren aspect of Canaan an inference against the truth of the Old Testament, in which the country is everywhere extolled as a land flowing with milk and honey. If, however, according to the accounts of modern travellers, a large laying out of gardens by Ibrahim Pacha could have an influence on the increase of the rain in the neighbouring country of Egypt, it may be supposed to what a degree the similar but certainly more susceptible climate of Canaan was dependent upon the operations of its inhabitants.

movements of His disciples ; as His Father's messenger, He followed the call of need, the track of recipiency, the paths of the poor, the ways of the sheep that had no shepherd, the movements of inimical and repelling antipathies and of sympathizing agencies ;—alternately yielding to the want felt by His exalted nature for silent communion with His Father, and to the desire and duty of appearing in the theocratic centre of His nation. Thus out of the narrowly restricted path of His Israelitish pilgrimage, was formed the far-reaching, much-embracing path of His journeyings. He went about doing good. He transformed the rugged path of constant temple-service into a happy pilgrimage of free and rejoicing love. His time was spent between worship in the great temple of creation, in which He was alone with His Father, especially upon the heights on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, and worship in the symbolic temple of His nation. In this journeying life He exhibited the union existing between an unfettered wandering life, passed amidst the scenes of nature and the absence of artificial wants, and the restricted life of that high degree of civilization which floats before the mind of Christian man as his exalted destiny. He revealed the rich inheritance of the believer who has not where to lay his head, but who, whether on the stormy midnight wave, or the burning noon-day journey, can with Him, and through Him, rest on the bosom of the Father, walk in the happy ways of His eternal Spirit, and find His meat and drink in the fulfilment of His will. By His birth, the cheerful pasture-fields of Bethlehem became fields of light, ever basking in the sun of joy. The town of Nazareth is ever the symbol of those obscure corners of the earth, in which many of the kings and princes of the spiritual kingdom, destined to prepare the way of the great Nazarene, have grown up in concealment. The lonely neighbourhood of Nazareth has deep and solitary valleys, covered with the most luxuriant vegetation, and silent retired paths, with rugged, snow-white, rocky walls ; holy places, once trodden by the Saviour's feet, and consecrated by His prayers.¹ Christ left Nazareth at the commencement of His public ministry. 'A prophet hath no honour in his native town.' The flame of the truly divine life could indeed be extinguished nowhere, but it would not choose the oppressive atmosphere of antipathy and indifference. Christ settled at Capernaum. This wealthy city, inhabited by publicans, soldiers, and travellers, was the most cosmopolitan dwelling He could have chosen within the limits of Israel's claims upon Him ; the centre of that caravan road of Galilee of the Gentiles, through which flowed the traffic between East and West, between Syria and Phoenicia. So near did the large-heartedness of that loving Prince of the whole race lead Him to the door through which He might already send out His welcome to all the world ; while, on the other hand, He sought and found amidst the population of the Sea of Galilee, the most genuine Israelites, the most pious and most liberal among the most unprejudiced. It was at Capernaum and

¹ *Bibl. Geographie*, by Barth, p. 31.

other places on the Lake of Gennesareth that He specially displayed His glory ; but they only plunged into deeper darkness, and turned the blessing into a curse.¹ What celestial brightness attends those memories of Jesus which hover over the Sea of Galilee ! It was on these declivities,² as also in the miracle of Cana,³ that those *antepasts* of the Lord's Supper took place, in the miraculous feedings of the multitude, in which Christ, for the moment, raised whole multitudes to a heavenly frame of mind. On the farther side of the lake, He enlightened the darkness of the country of the Gergesenes by His presence ; on the nearer, He manifested, by the most touching miracles of mercy, the advent of the kingdom of God. It was from one of these mountains that the sermon which represents the way of salvation as a progressive series of blessings,⁴ resounded throughout the world. Upon a mountain Christ manifested Himself to His most confidential disciples, in the brightness of His essential glory.⁵ It was from silent mountains that He often looked with secret grief, but also with the saving pity of a divinely ordained Redeemer, upon deluded Israel, whom He saw as exiled and cast out from their inheritance, and upon His pleasant land, and His unhappy people. With what emotion of heart did He sit upon the Mount of Olives, and behold in spirit the destruction of the temple and the ruin of the nation ! He foresaw that His own fate must be met at Jerusalem, yet He wept over the city ! He died before her gates, without the camp of the legal Church, outlawed and proscribed, upon the accursed tree. On the Mount of Olives, near to each other, are the two places where the Christian consecration of the earth, its

¹ Matt. xii. 23. Even the names of Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Chorazin have perished. Robinson, ii. 405.

² Matt. xiv.-xv. According to the indications given by Mark, the locality of both the miraculous feedings of the multitude must be sought on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee : Mark vi. and viii.

³ John ii. According to Robinson, Cana was not, as is usually supposed, the village of Kefr Kenna, about a league and a half N.E. of Nazareth, but a town three leagues distant from Nazareth, in a N.N.E. direction, where a ruin called Kana el Jelil is still pointed out.

⁴ 'The Kurun Hattin (horns of Hattin), between Mount Tabor and the Sea of Tiberias, is said by the Latins to have been "the Mount of Beatitudes," the place where the Redeemer delivered the Sermon on the Mount to the multitude standing on the adjacent plain. There is nothing in the form or circumstances of the hill itself to contradict this supposition ; but the sacred writers do not specify any particular height by name, and there are in the vicinity of the lake perhaps a dozen other mountains which would answer just as well to the circumstances of the history.'—Robinson, ii. 371.

⁵ 'The context of the narrative seems to imply, as has been shown by Lightfoot and Reland, that the Mount of Transfiguration is rather to be sought somewhere around the northern part of the lake, not very far from Cesarea Philippi, where there are certainly mountains enough. But a circumstance which these writers overlooked, and which puts Mount Tabor entirely out of the question, is the fact above substantiated, that long before and after the event of the transfiguration, the summit of Tabor was occupied by a fortified city.'—Robinson, ii. 359. 'Its wonderfully beautiful and regular form, and isolated position, caused it from very early times to be regarded by Christian tradition as the Mount of Transfiguration. I cannot, however, believe it, since the Saviour had withdrawn to Cesarea Philippi, to escape the researches of His enemies in the region of the sources of the Jordan ; a fact which makes it probable that one of the hills of Hermon may have been the scene of the transfiguration.'—L. Völter in *Plieninger's Weihnachtsblüthen*, p. 190.

glorification by the deepest woe and the highest ecstasy, took place — Gethsemane and the mountain of the Ascension. The breath of sorrow issuing from Gethsemane hallows the earth as a dark valley of holy suffering, of the terrors of judgment; the spirit of peace and victory issuing from Mount Olivet, makes the whole earth one bright hill of victory, the victory of Christ reaching to heaven. And finally, Golgotha, together with the holy sepulchre, represents the union of these two points, the place of the curse become the place of honour, the region at once of most terrible defeat and most glorious victory, the curse converted into a blessing, the old sad earth into a new and rejoicing world. As we have no certainty of the locality of Paradise, so neither have we of that of Golgotha; the mysterious place has communicated its sacredness to the whole world.

NOTES.

1. The relation between the life of man and the life of nature, is seldom seen in that purely spiritual light expressed in the sacred Scriptures. Man is often represented as the product of the region in which he is found; the influences which he receives therefrom being looked upon as his fate. Or nature is made to hold on her way, independently of the way of error and confusion, or of the heavenly way of man. Then, for a change, the opposite extreme is rushed into, and man is made the unconscious creator and conscious arranger and former of nature. By the first notion, man is made the child, by the latter the father, of nature. The distinction between the Father and the Son is misconceived, when man, who can only fulfil his destination as an instrument of the Son, is made a being equal to the Father. The Pantheist makes pretensions to being the first person in the Godhead. But the relation between individual man and the Son is also misconceived, when the former is made the product of his exterior world. Holy Scripture rightly makes man appear in his union with surrounding nature; it perceives in nature the sphere of man, dependent upon his mind and inclination. The earth stands, falls, and is renewed with man.¹

2. Schubert writes of the shores of the Dead Sea (*Reise in das Morgenland*, vol. iii. 85): ‘The shores of the sea are rich in beauty of outline, as sublime as I have anywhere witnessed, and by no means more desolate than those coast regions of the Red Sea at which we touched during our journey; in some districts, especially on the eastern margin, the vegetation of the ravines reaches to the water’s edge, and forms itself into thickets, even beyond the mouths of the Jordan.’ Of the Sea of Galilee (p. 238): ‘The vegetable world about Tiberias, though robbed of almost all its former ornaments, shows that the borders of this lake, if they were but rightly made use of, are capable of becoming a natural hothouse, in which

¹ [On the reciprocal action of countries and their inhabitants, see Schlegel’s *Philosophy of History*, *passim*; Humboldt’s *Cosmos*; and a very interesting little volume by William Miller, *The Plan of History*. On the adaptation of Palestine to its purpose, see Kurtz *On the O. T. Covenant*, vol. i. p. 147, and the works there cited.—ED.]

the growths of Egypt, and even of Arabia, would flourish. The date-palm, though seldom met with, flourishes with the same luxuriance as about Akaba and Alexandria.' Further on, Schubert calls the district 'a paradise over whose quiet lake a spirit of heavenly thoughts and memories seems to hover, while the most lovely and sublime of natural scenes is reflected in its waters.' In a bay 'where a warm spring falls into the sea,' he found a 'thicket of flowering oleander,' whose 'rosy glow spread abroad, like a dawn from the deep, over hills and valleys.' Robinson (*Researches in Palestine*, ii. 380, &c., vol. iii. p. 499, &c.) expresses himself less favourably of the shores of the Sea of Galilee. 'The lake presents, indeed, a beautiful sheet of limpid water, in a deep depressed basin; from which the shores rise, in general, steeply, and continuously all around, except where a ravine, or sometimes a deep wady, occasionally interrupts them. The hills are rounded and tame, with little of the picturesque in their form; they are decked by no shrubs nor forests; and even the verdure of the grass and herbage, which, at an earlier season of the year, might give them a pleasing aspect, was already gone; they were now only naked and dreary. Whoever looks here for the magnificence of the Swiss lakes, or the softer beauty of those of England and the United States, will be disappointed. My expectations had not been of that kind; yet from the romantic character of the scenery around the Dead Sea, and in other parts of Palestine, I certainly had promised myself something more striking.' If, then, we imagine these rounded western heights of the sea-shore in the splendour of their former vegetation, we have the softest and most powerful of minor keys (compare again Schubert, p. 250; Robinson, p. 539). The eastern shore is said to rise to a greater elevation, though not into steep rocky walls and rugged forms. 'Among the hills of the eastern shore, one is distinguished for its striking roundness of form; a plain runs at the foot of this eastern caldron-shaped hill.'—V. Schubert, p. 253. 'On the southern part of this lake, and along its whole eastern coast, the mountain wall may be estimated as elevated 800 or 1000 feet above the water, steep, but not precipitous.'—Robinson, ii. 416.¹

3. The division of Palestine into Judea, Samaria, Galilee, and Perea, which became more and more marked after the captivity, was caused as much by national as by geographical relations. Even before the captivity, Samaria presented a strong contrast to Judea, which was subsequently increased by the fact that the Samaritans represented a people composed of Jews and heathens, with modified religious tendencies, whose temple-service on Mount Gerizim was opposed to the temple-service on Moriah. Galilee also formed a contrast to Judea before the captivity (*Isa. viii. 23*); for here dwelt heathens scattered among Israelites, and no purely Israelitish blood was to be found.

¹ [Those who wish to study the geography of Palestine will find a complete list ('fuller, at the time of its preparation, than any other extant') of works on the subject in Robinson's *Researches*, ii. pp. 533-555.—ED.]

Besides, the popular mind of the Galileans was more related to the popular mind of the heathens who bordered on, or travelled through it, than was that of the Jews. Finally, Judea enjoyed the double advantage of exhibiting the sphere of the temple, properly so called, and the sphere of education. In both these respects it eclipsed Galilee. To this was afterwards added the fresh disadvantage, that it was geographically separated from Judea by the situation of Samaria. Perea, the region east of Jordan, was separated by that river from these three provinces. This district was bounded on the north and east by Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and Gaulonitis. All these districts were included by the Romans under the name of Syria. The Roman general Pompey attained possession of the country by the conquest of Jerusalem, 63 b.c. The fraternal war of the Maccabean princes, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, in which the deep schism between Pharisees and Sadducees bore bloody fruit, had brought him into the country. He made it dependent upon Rome, and united it with Syria; it retained, however, a remnant of independence, in being governed by a prince of its own, the ethnarch Hyrcanus. His favourite, Antipater, however, became, by his own subtlety and the favour of Caesar, procurator of the country, and left to Hyrcanus the mere shadow of authority. Herod, the son of Antipater, who was at first procurator of Galilee, by the favour of Anthony and Octavius, became, on the flight of Antigonus the Maccabee to Rome, king of Judea, b.c. 37. He governed Judea at the time of Christ's birth with a despotism which went on increasing till the close of his life. Augustus divided his dominions among his sons: Archelaus became ethnarch of Judea, Samaria, and Idumea; Herod Antipas became tetrarch of Galilee and Perea; Philip obtained possession of the northern part of the district east of Jordan, Batanea, Trachonitis, Gaulonitis, and Panias. The district of the ten cities, or Decapolis, consisted of separate townships, under the immediate supremacy of the Romans, scattered throughout the land, and inhabited by Greeks and Syrians. All the above-named small Jewish principalities fell one after another entirely under Roman power. This was first the case with Judea and Samaria, after the deposition of Archelaus on account of his tyranny (b.c. 6). The country was then placed under the proconsul of Syria, and governed by procurators. Once more, however, it was for a short time raised to the rank of a kingdom, under the rule of Herod Agrippa. At the commencement of Christ's public ministry, the region east of Jordan was governed by Philip, after whose death (A.D. 35) it was united to the Roman province of Syria. At this time Herod Antipas, the weak, yet cruel despot, who caused the death of John the Baptist, was still ruling over Galilee and Perea. He was banished in the year 39 to Lyons in Gaul. Herod Agrippa, however, the grandson of Herod, who was living in private life at Rome, had already obtained, through the favour of the Emperor Caligula, the former tetrarchy of Philip, and now Galilee and Perea were also bestowed upon him. To these the Emperor Claudius

added also Judea and Samaria ; so that the whole Jewish country once more formed a single Jewish kingdom. He died of a disease, with which he was visited at the moment of his greatest self-exaltation (A.D. 44). Palestine was now again united to the Syrian proconsulate ; and from this time the country advanced, under the threefold scourge of tyrannical Roman procurators, devastating highway robbers, and fanatic factions, towards its final catastrophe in the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). The region east of Jordan received (A.D. 53) once more an Idumean prince, Herod Agrippa II., who had, at the same time, oversight of the priesthood in Judea. He possessed, besides the tetrarchy of Philip, that of Lysanias also, and bore the title of king. In the Jewish war he united himself to the Romans.

4. The Jews had not suffered the Samaritans to take part in building their second temple (Ezra iv. 1). They had consequently set up their own worship on Mount Gerizim, and a mutual and ever increasing animosity had continually separated them from the Jews. Their religious development, from this time forth, could not but greatly differ in form from that of the Jews ; they had nevertheless so maintained that essence of the Jewish faith, the expectation of the Messiah, that, in the time of Christ, it was current even among the most ignorant of the people (John iv.) The supposition that they were of purely heathen descent (see Hengstenberg, *Beiträge zur Einleitung ins A. T.* vol. ii. p. 3, &c.) is certainly opposed by Christ's conduct towards them (John iv. compared with Matt. xv. 24). The reason adduced, viz., that the heathen colonists say (Ezra iv. 2) to the Jews, Let us build with you, for we seek your God, as ye do, does not prove that there were no Israelite elements among them ; it is quite natural that the prevailing and domineering heathen element should speak from its own consciousness. The fact that the people, in cases when the Jews were successful, appealed to their Jewish origin, and, when circumstances were altered, affirmed their Gentile descent, speaks more for their being, indeed, a mingled people than the contrary. That no Israelitish priests were found (2 Kings xvii. 26) among the remnant of Israelites, who gradually came forth from their concealment, and mingled with the colonists, and that the Jews at Jerusalem would not receive the Samaritans into their theocratic national union, for the sake of such a remnant, is but natural. Even in the saying, Matt. x. 5, 6, the Samaritans are not comprised among the Gentiles, but placed midway between Israel and the Gentiles. The disciples, indeed, were to confine their mission to those who had the first title to it, viz., genuine Israelites.

5. In Palestine was found every possible section of Judaism. Next to the Gentiles, living in contact with Jews in the ten cities, were the Samaritans ; heathens, who were both by birth and opinion judaized. Next to these were the Galilean Jews, who were more or less tinged with Heathenism. Then the obscure Jews of Perea ; and lastly, the genuine Judean Jews, who dispersed themselves from Judea throughout the whole world, and who culminated in the super-Judaism of the Pharisees and the two other sects.

PART II.

THE HISTORY OF THE BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF THE LORD JESUS.

SECTION I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

THE remembrance which the Church has preserved, and the testimony she has given to the childhood of the Lord Jesus, form a series of incidents, together displaying, in artless, poetical, and sacred delineation, on one side, the full reality and historic nature; on the other, the perfect ideality, of the individual life of Jesus in its beginnings and earliest events. They form a cycle: they manifest themselves, by the most speaking facts, to belong to the Christology of the childhood of Jesus. This cycle is naturally a circle of most mysterious and tender images, exhibiting the beauties and graces, as well as the terrors of poetry, in the most absolute reality. These images only differ from many of the productions of actual poetry, by surpassing, in their strict conformity to the due proportions of ideal perfection, all that is glaring and enthusiastic in more ordinary poetry, and, at the same time, all the images of the fancy. Their reality has always had the effect of banishing from the centre of Christian doctrine, the mutilated forms of Ebionitism, which cannot believe in the full spiritual glorification of corporeity.

In our days, indeed, the history of Christ's childhood seems to have been almost abandoned to Ebionitism. The practice of removing the ideality of Christ's life to greater and still greater distances from its commencement, has been constantly persevered in. At first, in accordance with the views of the ancient Ebionites and Socinians, it was not till His baptism that He was allowed to become the Son of God. Then, not till long after His baptism, and after having, as was supposed, first passed through the school of John the Baptist. Again another advance was made, and it was said that it was not till after His death that the image of Christ was produced, as an embellished remembrance of the actual Christ. And, further still, Paul is said to have been the inventor of mature, universal Christianity. A new station is next formed, by the opinion that the perfectly ideal, or, as it is rather thought, idealistic, view of the life of Jesus, given in the pseudo-Gospel of John, did

not arise till about the end of the second century. At last, even the present times are passed by, and Christianity is first to become a truth in the times of the coming Spirit. These spouting prophets of a spirit, who is not to kindle but to extinguish the light of the Gospel history, take one step further, and expect, with the Jews, the advent of the Messiah in a new religion. There is now but another advance, the abolition of all religion. Such is the historical progress of Ebionitism.

It is part of the notion of Christianity, that, as the incarnate Word, it should be perfect from its very origin. Christianity is distinctly a new principle, the principle of all improvement, and cannot itself meanwhile need improvement. It is the principle of the identity of the eternal Word and human corporeity, of real and ideal life; therefore it rejects every attempt to introduce into its origin, that incongruence between ‘the ideal and life’ which oppresses the ancient æon. It comes forth from the heart of God, as a new and miraculous life: hence a halo of miracles is formed around this central miracle; the rays of the rising sun.

To whom are we indebted for the history of Christ’s childhood? It is almost unnatural to let this question take the form of a laboured investigation. Mothers are the narrators of the histories of children. It was undoubtedly Mary who was the evangelist of the youthful history of Jesus, and it is not obscurely that she is pointed out as his authority by Luke (chap. ii. 19). It would be but natural that she should have preserved a written remembrance of what occurred in the house of Zachariah. The colouring, too, of a woman’s memory and a woman’s view is unmistakeable in the separate features of this history. When it is once ascribed to a female narrator, we feel that the fact, that ‘wise men from the East’ are introduced without further preface, that the taxing of Herod is designated the taxing of Caesar Augustus, who was really at the bottom of it, and many other difficulties, are at once explained. Then also we comprehend the indescribable grace, the quiet loveliness, and sacredness, of this narrative. That Mary, who at all events survived the pentecostal effusion of the Spirit on the Church of Christ, should have related to that Church the most important incidents of the childhood of Jesus, and that these communications should have been preserved as holy relics, is so simple and natural a supposition, that it would be superfluous to discuss it further.

NOTE.

The chief considerations which have been advanced against the history of Christ’s childhood, proceed from the above-mentioned Ebionite view of the life of Jesus. Having, however, already refuted this view, we shall not have occasion to enter any further into an explanation of the circumstance, that these communications have been so generally disregarded, in comparison with other portions of the sacred narrative; separate and special difficulties will, however, be treated of in their proper places.

SECTION II.

THE ANGEL GABRIEL.

(Luke i.)

That theocratic energy which was the soul of Israel's development, that silent process by which God was becoming man, and man becoming the son of God, seemed in the days of Herod the Great, if viewed according to general appearances, to have become almost extinct. But these appearances must have been deceptive. Never was a great and holy energy stunted to death in the midst of its development; and least of all could this most deeply human, this divine-human impulse, which was the energizing principle of the world's history, which had begun in such reality, evaporate at last into mere ideals and pictures of life. But it was in entire conformity with the nature of this its sublimest development, that the noble energy should concentrate itself in the secret recesses of the most profound and elect minds of Israel; that it should ripen in such minds into the form of an infinite mourning after God, an unspeakable anticipation and longing; and thus, constituting a state of perfect recipiency, should be waiting in silent expectation for a corresponding divine operation, a new revelation. While the nation in general seemed dying away like the body of an aged man, its glowing life had concentrated itself in the vital recesses of this body, and was there awaiting the hour of its second birth. So great an expectation—an expectation which God Himself had been bringing to maturity, by means of the works He had wrought during so many centuries of the world's history—could not fail of its accomplishment, that positive communication of life which it needed, and of whose advent it was itself a prophecy.

This expectation, though silent and secret, was strained to the very uttermost; hence its fulfilment could not but ensue in such sudden and great manifestations of the power of God, as might be compared to violent storms. It is after a long and anxious pause, on a sultry and stormy day, that the lightning generally appears. At last it darts suddenly forth, its wondrous flames unite heaven and earth, the thunder rolls, and now stroke upon stroke of thunder and lightning follow with no ambiguous purpose—for a new tone is to be given to the atmosphere to refresh the earth.

It was so with that objective divine operation which Zacharias and Mary experienced, when the birth of the forerunner was announced and promised to the former, and of the Lord to the latter.

This great and wonderful operation of God presupposed a matured recipiency in the deepest and noblest minds in Israel. It is in such a state of recipiency that we meet with the venerable priest Zacharias and his wife Elisabeth: they were pious and righteous in the true Israelite sense. Mary appears on the scene as the hand-maid of the Lord, the theocratic heroine, ready to surrender her whole life to God, and acquainted, as well as her priestly relatives,

with the spiritual nature of Messiah's dignity and kingdom. A similar state of perfect recipiency, in which the blossom of Israelite desire opened its petals to the sunshine of the new revelation, prevailed among the elect of those days, in general : Simeon and Anna are the representatives of this recipiency.

Such hearts, however, as were to be capable of welcoming and receiving the highest revelation of grace in its bodily manifestation, had to be prepared not merely by the bestowal of noble dispositions, but by their development—not merely in the school of Israelite doctrine, but of Israelite experience. They had to be thoroughly unhappy in the truest sense, to be brought to despair of the goodness of the old exterior world, and to experience, in the annihilation of their former ideals, the judgment of God upon its sinfulness, in which they also saw its misery and sadness. Thus alone could they have given up those false notions of a Messiah which were the ruin of their nation ; thus alone have known the happiness of receiving, with a poverty of spirit deep as their knowledge of the world, the Prince of the heavenly kingdom, who was to change judgment into salvation, and to build up a new world upon the ruins of the old.

The great sorrow of Zacharias and Elisabeth is known. They had no son. A threefold deprivation, since, under the Old Testament, piety had the promise of an earthly blessing, since the solitariness of their life in the hill country would make the time of advanced age the more gloomy, and since they would not behold the delight, the glory of Israel, which in their longing hearts would be naturally blended with the form of the child which was denied to them. The sorrow of Anna is equally manifest. It was as a widow that she took up her abode in the temple, after the death of her husband. The happiness of her life seems to have been buried with him. The aged Simeon was a theocratic Jeremiah, whom his sorrow for Israel, his ardent longing for the Messiah, had made a wandering Jew in a nobler sense. He was not to die till he had seen the Messiah. He must have breathed forth a long last sigh when he uttered the words, ‘This child is set for the fall of many in Israel.’ He had penetrated the hypocritical nature of most of the fathers and leaders of the nation ; but he was also acquainted with the ardent desires of those who were quiet in the land, who were to rise again through the Messiah. The sword had entered into his own soul, or he would not have been able to announce a similar lot to Mary. But what was the school of misfortune Mary could have passed through before she received the annunciation ? Certainly, mere talents, noble qualities of mind, a childhood filled with pious anticipations, heartfelt maidenly participation in Israel’s prayer for the advent of Messiah, enhanced by the proud yet sad consciousness of a descent from David concealed from the world, do not suffice to explain the secret of Mary’s preparedness to receive the wonderful communication of the New Testament life, in the strength and fulness of its incarnation. As a Jewess, she *must* have given up the old Israelite world, *must* have been brought to bury her old ideals by some judgment of the Lord. At all events,

this complete renunciation of the world must have been developed during the progress of some great visitation which she had experienced. But in what did her sorrow consist? Had she not borne it with holy womanliness, and concealed it under an ‘anointed face’? She seems to have been early betrothed to Joseph, according to Israelite law and custom. Perhaps she had been entrusted, as an orphan, to the protecting care of her older relation. But when the rich qualities of her glorious mind had attained to the maturity of maidenhood; when her freer and greater spirit, which was all unconsciously approaching to the New Testament standard, awoke within her, with all its wants; she then became conscious of the grave nature of this tie. Joseph did not understand her, in her deepest experiences. She was increasingly feeling the sad condition of the house of David and of Israel, which was so secretly forming into a judgment upon the inner life of her solitary heart. But, like a true daughter of Israel, she anointed her face; from the burnt sacrifice in which she offered up her first dreams of life and of the world to the great Israelite duty of legal obedience, she came forth as the virgin, in whom the new world was to have its beginning, the promise of the Redeemer to work with divine creative power, in whose womb the Gospel could assume flesh and blood.

Zacharias and Mary may be regarded as pre-eminently the mature fruits of the tree of Old Testament discipline and education. Divine illumination and divine chastisement had sanctified them, and led them to the very entrance of that Holy of Holies, where they might receive the announcement of the New Testament revelation of God.

The theocratic operation which, according to God’s righteous arrangement, such a disposition as theirs could not fail to experience, was naturally the last and highest manifestation of the Old Testament agency of God; of the power of God energizing towards its redeeming incarnation.

When, under the Old Covenant, God revealed Himself to the elect of Israel, these revelations were ever made with reference to His last and highest revelation, His manifestation in the God-man. They were the beginnings of His incarnation. Hence these divine operations always took a human form, in the prophetic ecstasy of those hearts that were visited, in the plastic power of their intuition, and especially when their vision attained the highest degree of intensity. The Son of man who was ever in the bosom of the Father as the coming One, or the Son of God who was ever in the heart of man as the desired One, appeared as present to the spiritually illumined, inwardly perceptive vision of the holy seers. This was the angel of God’s presence; the eternal Man in the self-contemplation of God, the God-man about to become such in the ardent desires of Israel’s life, the non-temporal Christ ever present by the Spirit to the minds of the prophets. Hence He is identified with Jehovah, as well as distinguished from Him.¹

¹ This angel was Jehovah Himself, so far as he was His manifestation, so far as he was the plastic image of His coming; but he was the angel of the Lord, so far as

The high communication in which God finally stilled the universal struggle between His super-mundane concealment, and matured human desire for Him, resulted in two great manifestations of His miraculous agency, an agency at once theocratic and gracious. The first preliminary communication was made to Zacharias. It was a creative agency, which in its revivifying action prepared the life of John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ. The second and more glorious communication was made to Mary. It deposited in her soul, in the soul of her organism, the germ of the incarnation of Christ.

Both these elect vessels received this communication in an ecstasy, in which the creative power of God, as a gracious power, manifested itself to them under the form of an angel, and in which the interaction which took place between their minds, and the divine power which came upon them, caused them distinctly to recognize in this divine power the word of revelation, and formed itself into a dialogue with the angel. They trembled before the power of this manifestation, in which the word of God flowed into their souls as a creative power. They called the angel who brought them the word which laid in them the foundation of a new æon, according to the power of his word, Gabriel, the man of God, the hero of God.

This angel of the presence, whom many in Israel had seen under various circumstances, was called Raphael in the sphere of popular life, when bringing deliverance or assistance to the necessities of the individual. But when to the view of the inspired he presented himself personally as the creative announcer of the kingdom of heaven, of the new æon of the world, he was called Gabriel. When, finally, he appeared before them as the victor over the old æon, as the destroyer of the kingdom of the old serpent, he was called Michael. It is always the same christological operation, the one image of Christ; but this one image in ever varying relations; the angel of the presence developing his different modes of operation.¹

subjective contemplation clothed him with symbolical elements. He was more than any other actual angel, because he was Christ. He was not, however, the already incarnate Christ, but Christ on the road to His incarnation, as He preliminarily assumed flesh and blood in the plastic contemplations of the prophets. Comp. Gen. xviii, and xxxii. 24; Exod. xxiii. 20, 21, and xxxiii. 14; Mal. iii. 1. In the latter passage, this angel appears as the Angel of the Covenant, that is, of the interaction between Jehovah and Israel. [According to Hengstenberg (*Christology*, iv. 306, &c.), there are four opinions regarding this angel: 1. that he is a created angel employed to act in the name of God; 2. that he is a natural phenomenon or visible sign, by which Jehovah made His presence known; 3. that he is not a person distinct from Jehovah, but only a form of His manifestation; and 4. (which is maintained by the great majority of trustworthy theologians) that he is the Logos of John.—Ed.]

¹ The identity of the angel Gabriel with the angel of the presence appears from a comparison of the following passages. According to Dan. vii. 13, Daniel had a vision, evidently a vision of the Messiah (comp. Havermick's *Commentar*, p. 242); he was like a son of man. According to chap. viii. 15, a vision stands before him like a man (פָּנִירָאָה נֶבֶר); this vision is afterwards, ver. 16, called Gabriel (גַּבְרִיאָל the man of God, the hero of God). While this angel is talking with him, the prophet falls fainting to the earth. But the angel touches him, and lifts him up again. The appearance of Christ in His glory has exactly the same effect upon the Apostle John, according to Rev. i. 17. As long as Christ only appears to sinful man, His appearance as the concrete judgment of God strikes him to the earth; but as

After what has already been said, it might seem to some superfluous to notice in this place the general objections made to the biblical doctrine of angels. Our view, however, of the angel Gabriel would be very erroneously judged, if regarded as antagonistic to the objectivity of the angelic world. Hence it will be necessary, for its further confirmation, that it should be stated in connection with the general doctrine of angels.

The doctrine of angels is derived first from the testimony of theocratic spirits, of elect individuals. They saw visions; and inquiry must first concern itself with their testimony. When the narratives of such visions are declared to be myths because they relate this miraculous occurrence, a vision, criticism is entirely overthrown. In the zeal of negation, it is overlooked that it is only the vision of the narrator which has first to be dealt with. Now, mythology has neither the modesty nor refinement to speak of visions in which the inhabitants of the heavenly world appear. In her world, the vision and the sensuous perception are one and the same; the unearthly beings go about freely, and are seen with earthly eyes, for their world itself is a mythological vision. It is quite otherwise with the appearances of angels in the lives of the saints, though the traditions of some of these narratives in the Old Testament show a tinge of the mythological in their setting.¹ According to the testimony as He touches him, that communication of life takes place, which lifts the condemned sinner up again. In chap. ix. 21, he who appears is called the man Gabriel (*the man* as more definitely the man of God). The mysterious man, chap. x. 5 (**אִישׁ אֶחָד**), appears alone, and in priestly glory, being represented in the same manner as the Messiah is by John, in the Apocalypse, chap. i. 13. To reassure the terror-stricken prophet, he takes the ordinary form of a son of Adam (**בָּנֵי אָדָם**). He distinguishes the archangel Michael (vers. 13 and 24) from himself. For as the theocratic judgments were to further the theocratic revelations, Michael was to come to the assistance of Gabriel. The archangel Michael (**מַיְכָאֵל**) who is like God (?) executes the judgments of God (comp. Dan. xii. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 16; Jude ver. 9; Rev. xii. 7, 8). But as the angel of the presence is not quite identical with Christ as He appeared, but rather with Christ as about to appear, so also is it especially with the two forms into which the angel of the covenant branches off, Gabriel and Michael; the former is the world's redeemer *becoming such*, the latter the world's judge *becoming such*, christological presentiments and the approach of divine judgment, giving to the good the preponderance over the evil. When, in the developments of Jewish Rabbinism the unity of the angel of the covenant was lost in various ramifications (Gabriel, Raphael, Michael, Uriel, and others), the misconception of the coming Messiah was already announced; pure Israelite feeling, however, always recognized the identity of these angelic forms with the angel of the covenant. If the Rationalist will insist upon designating angelic apparitions as illusions, they must then be thus more strictly defined; they are the illusions of the very elect among mankind, and of their most exalted frames; they are twin-children with those holiest convictions, which founded the new and Christian world upon those very frames which these illusions gave birth to. They would be illusions of a peculiar kind indeed.

¹ [This expression must be interpreted by the statements of the author in sec. 5, on the ideality of the Gospel History. In that section he uses the term 'mythological' of whatever glorifies the actual in the ideal, and speaks of a true mythology which saw the coming Redeemer in human persons or in ordinary events. If by *mythological* in the present passage he means, as it must be owned he seems to mean, something less christological and inspired, something merely human and erroneous, then he not only sadly mistakes the difference between Hebrew and heathen mythology, but gives up the very position he himself occupied in the above-mentioned section.—ED.]

mony of the theocratic Church, the saints saw visions. These assurances rest upon the same foundation of veracity upon which their inspired testimony to the principles of the heavenly life, which they planted in the earth, depends. The critic has first duly to estimate the difference between the subjective vision and its objective matter, unless he would rashly and hastily cut the Gordian knot with his sword. He must not proceed strictly to test the objectivity of the vision till he has first treated its subjective dignity with reverence.

This remark, that angelic appearances are chiefly found in the form of visions, has not, however, to be set before the critic alone, but also before the orthodox. Never has an angel been seen in the usual direction of the eyes towards the surface of the earth, when the eyes have been in their ordinary sensuous condition. Such a sight seems rather to have depended upon some peculiarity of mind, some special frame, at some great crisis of the world's history, which may be regarded as predisposing to an extraordinary revelation.¹ As the eye that beholds the sun must be endowed with the sun-gazing capacity, so must there be a spiritual disposition in those who behold spirits, an angelic one in those to whom angels appear. This explains the reason, perhaps, why one of the women who visited the tomb saw two angels, when the other perceived but one; why the apostles so suddenly saw angels standing beside them on the Mount of Olives, and other similar circumstances. The capacity for such sight would be different in different men, and in the same man at different moments. It depends upon a frame of mind in which the eye of the body does not stand in its usual opposition to the inner eye, the sight of the heart; in which the polar opposition between the two is annulled in the unity which is the foundation of both. The eye of the body is, so to speak, plunged into the depths of the heart; the inmost heart has entered into the bodily eye; and thus the visionary and ecstatic man has a glimpse of a world in which the contrast between the internal and external disappears, in which the struggle between heaven and earth is extinct. Such seeing, therefore, is no common perception, but a vision. It is certain that the Bible sometimes speaks of angels with dogmatic certainty (e.g., Heb. ii. 2), and sometimes in a symbolical manner. We must consequently distinguish between symbolical visions of angels, and such statements as agree with the notion of an objective angelic world.

Even symbolical visions of angels are more or less objective, inasmuch as the ecstasy must always be the result of an influence which must be looked upon as a divine operation.

Most numerous are those subjective and symbolical representations of angels, which are found in the history of all times and

¹ ['It is in accordance with the analogy of history that great manifestations and epochs, designed to satisfy the spiritual wants of ages, should be anticipated by the prophetic yearnings of pure and susceptible hearts, inspired by a secret divine consciousness.' Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 23.—ED.]

places. When man receives with delight some great assistance from on high, an angel is present to his mind by means of that plastic power which intuitively thus regards the circumstance. This form is actual in his mind. It is, as formerly remarked, his 'second sight' of Christ. Such angelic appearances must occur under the most varied forms. Indeed, education, and even variety of mental perception, will exert their influence on the forms of these representations of angels, though they are not mere subjective fictions, but the results of a divine influence upon the mind. Of a more important character are those great angelic forms who pass through the world, as spirits of vengeance, of pestilence, of death, or similar divine messengers, in conjunction with the powers of the elements. They represent the extraordinary visitations of God, exhibiting them in their true character, as mysterious powers proceeding immediately from God, and in their highest purpose, as sent with reference to the glory of Christ. Thus coming from God, and thus referring to Christ, even the darkest visitation becomes an angel of light, and solemnizes its symbolic incarnation.¹

But the most exalted operations of God are those in which the communication of His very life are concerned, in which the whole incarnation of Christ is expressed. These appear to the spectator, as has been pointed out above, as the angel of the divine presence. Hence out of one image are developed various images of the archangel. The archangel surpasses the ordinary angelic world as an image and operation of Christ : Christ stands above the angels.

But as operations may become angels in the horizon of the spectators, so also may angels manifest themselves in operations. That Holy Scripture does announce the appearance of actual angels, cannot be denied, nor has anything as yet been advanced antagonistic to this announcement.

Some seek to avoid this question by the remark, that the doctrine of angels belongs neither to the dogmatic nor religious matter of Scripture.² Did then the Scriptures concern themselves to give us information about the physiology of angels? In the end, however, even such a view would not deliver us from this difficult question. Our religious view of life must embrace the whole world ; and whether the doctrine of angels is in the Bible or not, we must try to come to a decision about it.³ A multitude of ob-

¹ He maketh the winds His messengers, the flames of fire His ministers (Ps. civ. 4, German vers.) In His kingdom wind and fire are not abstract phenomena, as they are to the profane observer. The wind is here a body, having a soul, a thought of God, which urges it to fulfil God's purposes ; it is this that makes it an angel. The flames of fire are animated, as it were, by the Lord's commission, which they have to fulfil ; it is this that makes them the ministers of His majesty.

² Schleiermacher, *der christliche Glaube*, vol. i. p. 204.

³ [Not, however, forgetting the words of Calvin, 'in tota religionis doctrina, tenendum esse unam modestiæ et sobrietatis regulam, ne de rebus obscuris aliud vel loquamur, vel sentiamus, vel scire etiam appetamus quod Dei verbo fuerit nobis traditum. . . . Theologo non garriendo aures oblectare, sed vera, certa, utilia docendo, conscientias confirmare propositum est.' And see what he says about the man who speaks as if he had dropped from heaven, and were telling us what he had seen with his eyes. *Instit.* I. xiv. 4.—ED.]

jections to the doctrine of angels has been advanced. We will take these objections in pairs, that is to say, we will arrange them in opposing pairs, as casting light upon or abolishing each other. At one time, it is said that God has no local palace in heaven, and keeps no such heavenly court, after the fashion of Oriental princes, as the idea of angels supposes.¹ Then, again, angels are represented as beings existing between two worlds, who, as such, must be lost in the regions of empty space.² The one representation is evidently antagonistic to the other, and they might therefore be left to annihilate each other. We will, however, consider them separately. If the doctrine of Jehovah's heavenly palace were really found in its literal sense in the Old Testament, Judaism would be a kind of Heathenism; and the doctrine of God's omnipresence could not be so decidedly expressed in its view of the world, as e.g. in Ps. cxxxix. Every unprejudiced mind must easily perceive that in the light of this doctrine, as well as in the whole teaching of Hebrew Monotheism, such words as relate to the special dwelling-place of God in heaven, must have a symbolical meaning. Let us now consider the angels of the highest heaven, or of the citadel of the universe, as beings existing between the worlds. This view of their peculiarity may perhaps be found in Jean Paul, but not in John or Paul. Holy Scripture knows nothing of this abstract inter-mundanism (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 40, Matt. xxii. 30). Hence, neither the heathen court of angels, nor these modern ethereal angels, are scriptural. The next pair of objections appears in the following form.³ First, it is said angels are incorporeal beings; and an incorporeal being cannot appear. Then it is remarked, that it would be contrary to divine providence, if there were such beings and appearances, since their agency would deprive men of their independence. Therefore an angel is an incorporeal being, and yet again so substantial a one, that he attacks human independence. When, however, the notion of incorporeal individuals is considered by itself, it is evident that a phantom is but produced for the sake of obtruding it upon the Bible. For in the Bible all beings have their proper bodies, conformably to their spheres (1 Cor. xv. 38). This notion, however, could hardly maintain itself in presence of the test furnished by a sound view of the world. For the form of individual personality must be everywhere recognized in creation, as a power which as a speaking monad must, by its very existence, assimilate corporeal matter. But it is said that the existence of angels disturbs human spontaneity. Somewhat in the same manner, perhaps, that moonlight interferes with the regulations for the lighting of the streets. Demoniacal human spirits seem most fearfully to interfere with the independence of thou-

¹ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 4th edit. vol. i. 114.

² Schleiermacher, *der christl. Glaube*, Pt. i. 204.

³ Comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 117. Comp. with respect to the second objection, the work of W. Hoffmann against Strauss, entitled : *das Leben Jesu, &c., geprüft für Theologen und Nichttheologen*, p. 123.

sands; yet they actually exist. Angels, on the contrary, only manifest themselves with extreme rarity to the inner man of the receptive spirit, and not without being more or less bidden by his frame of mind. As the muses visit the poet alone, so do the angels visit only the religious and elect. Again, it is at one time said that the Jews brought back a more particular, definite doctrine of angels from the Babylonian captivity, and that the names given to the angels were the result of the influence of the Zend religion.¹ Then it is found strange that the angels, and especially Gabriel, should bear Hebrew names.² It may be conceded that the Jews, under the influence of the Persian doctrine of Amshaspands, did further develop their doctrine of angels. But from the circumstance that these more developed forms of angels bear Hebrew names, and are represented as speaking the Hebrew tongue, it must be allowed that the development in general, is one quite in conformity with Israelite Monotheism. The fact, however, of a fresh development within the theocratic soil being promoted by a heathen influence, is not equivalent to the implantation of a heathen notion, as the critic supposes when he says, 'Were these notions false as long as they were confined to strangers, and not true until they were transferred to the Jews?' The Jews always had their own doctrine of angels (comp. Gen. xix.) If this doctrine was developed under foreign influences, this development nevertheless was organically conformable to the organism of Monotheism.³ Its angels could as little be transformed into Amshaspands, genii, or inferior gods, as the fallen spirit, Satan, could be transformed into Ahriman, the evil god. The germ, however, from which they developed their high-enthroned spirits was, as we have seen, the angel of the divine presence. This development may even be regarded as a development of Old Testament Christology, inasmuch as the separate forms of the life of the coming Messiah were therein explained (comp. Isa. xi. 2, Apoc. i. 4). The Israelite had no need to introduce the number seven from the Amshaspands into this development; for he was already accustomed to discover the fulness of life in the same holy number: to meet with this number elsewhere, could at most incite him thus to represent the forms of the angel of the covenant. The obscuration of Christology first began with the decay of the conviction that visions of the becoming God-man were dogmatically fixed in these angel forms. It was, therefore, not only allowable, but a proceeding which reformed old errors, when the true theocrats of Israel called the glorious manifestation of the becoming Messiah by the name of Gabriel. The theocratic seer thereby testified at once to his sense for the ideal and for history. His sense for the ideal, in giving the angel a

¹ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 113.

² *Id.* p. 114.

³ [See Hengstenberg's *Dissert. on the Genuineness of Daniel*, pp. 127-140 (Clark's Tr.); Fairbairn's *Hermeneutical Manual*, p. 203, &c.; and the very able refutation of the rationalist arguments on this point by Mill, *Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, pp. 123-135.—ED.]

name which designated him as an operation. He called the creative operation of grace, in its divine power, the hero of God, because it appeared to him in the divine-human form. His sense for history, because this divine operation was continually reappearing in Israel; it had its rhythm, it repeated and enhanced its manifestations. Therefore the seer who had seen it, fixed it and named it according to his own experience. This name then became a sign to any other who might or who was to experience it. He might be convinced of communion with his fellow-believers even in this experience and recognition. A theocratic Church could not but designate its heavenly experiences, because it experienced the definite progress of God's redeeming purpose in a succession of events, and not a nameless alternation of divine things in physical perpetuity.

The arguments just cited against the doctrine of angels, as little disturb our faith in these heavenly beings, as the prowling of young bears over a sunny meadow would disturb the light fluttering of butterflies over its variegated flowers.¹

See C. C. L.

Of more importance is the remark, that appearances of angels have become things unheard of in modern times, and thus seem, like ordinary spiritual apparitions, to have vanished before the daylight. It must not, however, be overlooked, that the angels of the old theocracy were only present at special periods, and when new foundations of revelation were to be laid. The modern world is indeed a deeper, broader, and more powerful stream, yet but a stream pursuing its appointed and regular course, an effluence only from the miraculous age of Christ's appearing. The angels who appeared at His grave, opened at once that grave and our æon. This æon is to last till the end of the world. Then shall the angels again appear within the region of humanity (Matt. xiii. 39). But the peculiarity of this Christian æon must also be taken into account. Christ appeared, and believing Christendom attained, by His Spirit, to the perception of His glory. There is now a satisfaction for the christological aspirations of man; the capacity for receiving angelic visions is absorbed in Christian knowledge. In this respect the angels may be compared to the stars of heaven, which disappear before the rising sun, while at noonday even the full moon seems but a white cloud.

The possibility of the existence of such beings as the angels of Holy Scripture is more and more corroborated by the discoveries of modern science. We see stars of all colours, and of every variety of material condition, traversing infinite space, many of a lightness as ethereal as golden dreams or spectral spheres. The spirits that inhabit them must correspond, in the rapidity and freedom of their powers of motion, to the elf-like nature of their abodes. To those philosophers, indeed, who see in all the starry canopy only 'rocks of

¹ [For satisfactory answers to the objection that God is immanent in the world, and therefore needs no angels—'a sensitive concern for the honour of the Supreme, which Mill thinks is 'somewhat misplaced and superfluous'—see Calvin's *Instit. I.* xiv. 11; Sibbes' Works, vi. 320 (Nichol's Ed.); Mill's *Mythical Interpretation*, p. 85; and Ebrard's *Gospel History*, p. 165.—ED.]

light,' uninhabited wastes, the whole world of space is but an Ahri-man, a dark world from which spirit is excluded. But if heaven is really inhabited, as we may expect according to the analogy of the earth, it cannot but be regarded as a vast realm of spirits. In this vast realm are found those ministering spirits whose objective existence is certainly assumed when they are spoken of in the Epistle to the Hebrews. But we must delay considering the various kinds of angelic beings till we have first considered the frames of mind which can apprehend them. In the stillness of night we may hear the rushing of the distant stream, which we could not perceive amidst the noises of day; and the light in a distant cottage window is seen to cast its gleam through the whole neighbourhood, while the burning of the whole cottage would scarcely have been noticed by daylight. The roar of Niagara is said to be much better heard at a certain distance than in its immediate vicinity. The same distinctions prevail within the sphere of the inner life. Most minds are incessantly and wholly filled, nay, tied and bound, with the bustle of external events. Their eyes can scarcely fix upon anything merely great or beautiful, which passes them bodily, because they seek the one thing needful in too many things, they suffer from the quest after everything. When, however, this quest after every kind of thing becomes the possessing demon of an age, or even its very worship, we cannot be surprised if that deeply contemplative mood, which believes in the passage of spirits from star to star, from heaven to earth, should disappear. When any one has once taken his position in the mill of world-craving selfishness, and has set all its wheels in motion, he could not hear the fall of Niagara, even if it were close at hand.

But there are souls that have a higher feeling for infinity, because they have the courage to let go those things among the many which are not in conformity with their disposition. They can even, under certain circumstances, welcome the ruin, the end of this world. It is, however, natural that one in whose eyes the world, with its fashions, passes away, should obtain an organ, or rather that the organ should be developed within him, by means of which he looks into the very heavens, and experiences heavenly influences. When the old world perishes, and a new one is expected from heaven, the noblest hearts are, so to speak, vacant, or rather open, for heaven; no longer filled by the old world, which, with its fashions and bustle, is dead to them. In such a condition, they are capable of hearing the voices of spirits, and of beholding the angels of God. It was in such a frame of mind that the women visited the tomb of Jesus; to them all the glory of the world was buried in that grave. Therefore they had an open eye for the messengers of heaven. Thus also was it that the eyes of the disciples were opened on Olivet, when Jesus ascended to heaven. Earth melted into nothingness when they saw the Lord depart from them; now, therefore, they were able to perceive the messengers from heaven, and to receive their message.

The beholders of angels become in their ecstasy, as it were, released

from the common interests of earth, temporarily ‘absent from the body ;’ and therefore spiritually disposed beings having intercommunion with a higher sphere of life, and that a sphere which bends down towards theirs, as they in spirit rise towards it.¹ But when the spirits of different spheres of life have a common interest, which equally embraces both, they actually meet together in one sphere ; they now operate upon each other, and, when their influences are mutually felt, they are even capable of being personally visible to each other. When the aspirations of Greece invisibly concurred with the missionary impulses of Paul on the sea-coast of Troas, like two approaching flames, then Paul saw in a vision a man of Macedonia standing before him (Acts xvi. 9).² The spirits of Peter and Cornelius so strongly influenced each other, when Peter at Joppa had approached the town of Cesarea, that each was in a vision directed to the other (Acts x.) If these two cases do not exactly express the relation between the spirits of earth and those of a higher world (though in the case of Peter there is at the same time a communication between Christ and himself, and in the case of Cornelius, the communication between him and the objective angel-world cannot be denied),³ yet they are, on the other hand, specially adapted, as examples easily comprehensible, to exemplify the law of visions which we have laid down. The history of the transfiguration, however, presents us with a more difficult and more eminent example. The relative intercourse between the spirits of Moses and Elias, and Christ, draws them into the Lord’s sphere of life, when He was about to inaugurate his last journey to His death by His transfiguration ; and by the powerful *rappo*rt between Jesus and His disciples, they also were partakers of this vision. A contrast to this attraction which takes place between God’s heroes from sphere to sphere, causing them spiritually to blend in one sphere, is found in the general *rappo*rt between angels and children. The peculiar affinity between the moon and the sea is well known ; we understand that a somnambulist may be, as it were, possessed by the influence of light of the new moon ; it is known that sainfoin celebrates the influence of the sun by a gentle trembling like a passing spirit ; we are acquainted with the infinitely far-reaching influences of light, and are inclined, in all these respects, to believe in the most spirit-like influences, even in matter. But when the immeasurably distant influence of spirits upon spirits—it might almost be said, of the most delicate of lights upon the most delicate lights—is spoken of, then common sense stumps in its clumsiest wooden shoes into the midst of the discussion, and dis-

¹ 1 Pet. i. 12.

² Formerly they brought the beautiful woman from Troy. Beauty had not satisfied them. Now the Crucified One was to be brought to them from Troas, for their salvation through His word.

³ Mary Magdalene, as released from earth, had an open sense for angels at the grave of Jesus ; but anxiety concerning the body of Jesus, as well as the attraction which the risen Saviour exercised over her mind, resulted in her rising rapidly and wondrously above the angelic appearance.

misses the matter with the cheap remark: Imagination, enthusiastic illusions, or legends. When the full import of the sympathies, of which a faint notion is expressed when the tendencies of this age are allowed to speak out, is scientifically recognized, we shall be forced to acknowledge that the influences of spirits between star and star must be far more powerful than that of starry light, or of any other attracting or repelling forces.

We conclude, then, that when spirits dwelling in different spheres are brought to identity of disposition, when one thought vibrates in them, one interest animates them, they will exert an influence upon each other, and may be sent to one another.¹

But every influence of this kind may become plastic in the mind of the ecstatic. As in photography² a means has been found of fixing and rendering visible the images reflected upon a surface, by objects placed opposite to it; so is an ecstasy a similar means of detaining certain spiritual influences, and translating them according to their actual import in sight and speech, which in truth they already are, though in a latent manner. Objects are always reflecting their images upon opposite surfaces; but photography alone makes them visible and preserves them. So also are spirits ever influencing spirits, though at great distances; but it is only in the ecstatic state that these influences obtain an actual plastic form.

From what has been advanced, then, it follows that appearances of spirits from other worlds are, under the given conditions, imaginable, when the visionary mind, freed from its own world, receives from the spirit most kindred to itself in another world, an influence which its own plastic agency translates into form, words, and perhaps also into a name; just as the light reflected from one countenance to another is re-formed into a countenance in the eye of the latter.

Since, however, souls are active in their operations, these influences between distances may be regarded as approaches.

The spirits, however, of the subtler regions of the universe, whose corporeity must be almost identical with their operations, as far as their delicacy is concerned, must be able in this organization to hover through the world with a freedom which can scarcely be represented by the most refined of earthly comparisons. The kingdom of God embraces in its development various spheres; as the history of civilization does various countries. The spirits of education who promote civilization upon earth are not restrained by the boundaries of nations, they overleap mountains and provinces. It is even so with the spirits of the theocracy; they overpass the barriers of the earthly senses, the limitations of earth. But when the inter-

¹ [It is quite possible that there exist many spiritual sympathies and relations with which we are yet unacquainted, but these are surely too uncertain to sustain the foregoing argument. And it is perhaps not very wise of us to invite an adversary into a region which he may term pseudo-scientific, and which may provoke him to taunt us with being driven from the region of ascertained and universally admitted facts.—EN.]

² Mirrors, in general, perform the same office in rendering our thoughts perceptible; but the mirror does not detain the image, while photography renders it permanent. The former more resemble a dream, or passive *mental* clairvoyance, while photography is like the morally free state of ecstasy.

course between them is to become a special influence of heaven upon earth, this ever takes place at a most critical and decisive period, pre-ordained by God. It is then that the Lord sends His holy angels.

Holy Scripture speaks of the appearing of angels in the most literal sense. We do not reckon the angel Gabriel among them, not because he is beneath this category, but far above it, as the angel of the divine presence, acting in creative power in the last moments prior to his incarnation.¹

NOTE.

Even the most objective angelic apparition is symbolic, inasmuch as the nearest approach of a spirit ever requires the plastic co-operation of the mind of the spectator. The element of the symbolic enters even into love, as existing between man and man. The beloved object is a vision. On the other hand, even the most subjective vision of angels is not purely subjective; it is an objective divine operation coming in the light and power of a christological image from God to man. [Such an objectiveness as this, however, by no means comes up to that which is implied in Scripture; and it is to be regretted that the author has not more distinctly brought out the difference between the objective appearance of the angels themselves, and the objective operation by which the minds of men were prepared for their visits. For while the minds of those to whom they were sent were no doubt most frequently in a state of preparedness, that state of mind was so far from being the cause, that it was not invariably even a requisite condition of the appearance. See, *e.g.*, the case of Sodom. Moreover, if angels appeared in bodies which could partake of earthly nourishment (as they sometimes did), are we not justified in concluding that these bodies were visible to the merely bodily eye? They were not, of course, sent at random, not sent as idlers to hover before those to whom they had no message; but those fit persons to whom they were sent saw them with the bodily organ of vision; and to prove that these persons were generally in an exalted frame of mind, is to prove nothing whatever regarding the objective appearance of what they then saw. The case of Samuel mistaking the voice of the Lord for the voice of Eli is instructive, in showing us the purely objective nature of such phenomena.—ED.]

SECTION III.

ZACHARIAS.

(Luke i.)

It is a mark of the refined consistency of the theocratic spirit, that the visibly impending event of the incarnation of God should first have been announced within the sanctuary of the Jewish temple;

¹ When the older theologians designated the angel of the covenant the uncreated Angel, they thereby declared that he was not an angel in the narrower sense, but more than one; even Christ, appearing as an angel, prior to His incarnation.

that the Jewish priesthood, in the person of one of its holiest members, and during the performance of one of its sacred functions, should first have been admitted to the knowledge of this great and germinating mystery. After the long silence of the prophetic Spirit, an aged priest was destined to be the first who was again to proclaim the prophetic Gospel of the coming Messiah, and a priest's son was appointed to close the long series of Messianic prophets, as the immediate forerunner of Christ. The temple seems, indeed, at this time to have been almost entirely occupied by a dead and hypocritical priesthood; but the Spirit of revelation knew how to find the healthy member of the diseased body. The divine communication which Zacharias received in the temple was indeed like a whisper from the pure Spirit of revelation, shunning the false audience of a priesthood plunged in a debased fanaticism. He was, moreover, obliged to carry it in silence, like a secret treasure, to the solitude of his home, to secure it from the profanation of the other priests of his order. The theocracy could not but honour the temple, the hour of prayer, and the true priest, now that it was about to form the eternal and true sanctuary in presence of the symbolical One. Even the angel of the divine presence went thither and showed Himself to the priest, when He was about to put on human nature.

We have already spoken of the state of mind which made Zacharias susceptible of the divine revelation. In the melancholy resignation of painfully-felt childlessness, he had left his home,¹ with his fellow-priests of the course of Abia, to perform the services of the temple during his week of office.² By the casting of the lot, the office of burning incense fell to him. It would be impossible for Zacharias to offer this great sign of the united prayer of Israel, without bringing before the Lord the concerns of His people. Hence his soul had undoubtedly attained to a fervency of theocratic prayer for Israel at the conclusion of this symbolical act, and he was about to leave the temple, when the wondrous power of Jehovah's covenant-grace was manifested to him in the appearance of the angel Gabriel.³

Undoubtedly the ideal Zion and his domestic ideal had been a

¹ In Luke i. 39 this is called a town of Judah. According to the opinion of many, the town of Jutta, mentioned Josh. xv. 55 and xxi. 16, according to others, Hebron is intended. Nothing can be said with certainty in favour of its being Hebron. If the capital of Judea were thus designated (in which case, however, the article would be wanted), Bethlehem might even then compete with Hebron. Since, however, the designation, 'a town of Judah,' would be equally striking if applied to so large a town, the conjecture which many have expressed, that the Evangelist thus modified the original expression, to the town of Jutta, because he was probably unacquainted with the town, seems allowable. Jutta is in the hill country south of Hebron. [Hebron has been adopted by many on account of its being one of the most notable of the cities of the priests. The claims of Ain Karim are advanced by Thomson (*Land and Book*, p. 664, ed. 1863), but on no other ground than tradition and a general agreement with the requirements of the narrative.—ED.]

² The four and twenty classes of priests performed the service of the temple each for a week, according to an appointed succession. The several functions were apportioned by lot.

³ When De Wette remarks (*Erklär. des Luk.*, &c., p. 10), that the angel did not appear to Zacharias 'in an ecstasy,' we must recall what has already been said about visions of angels.

thousand times already blended in his contemplations. Hence the promise that it should be fulfilled was now blended with the promise of a son in the message of the angel.

The angel stood at the right hand of the altar of incense, a good omen for Zacharias. But he was terrified; the revelation found corners as yet unenlightened, and remains of unmelted obstinacy and unextinguished bitterness in his soul, although in the depths of his heart there was a living agreement therewith, his life was radically conformed to it. Hence his individuality stands out. His wife Elisabeth was to bear him a son. He was to be called John, the gracious gift of God;¹ he was to be a messenger of God's favour to his father, and a cause of joy to many. His life was to be great; and he was to be sanctified from his mother's womb through the holy dispositions of his parents, sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Hence his development would proceed without great deviations in the direct line of the unfolding of the divine light in his life. It was, however, to be protected by the ordinance of the Nazarite;² he was to pass his life in the abstinence of one vowed to God. This promised one was to turn many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God. He was to go before the face of the Lord, according to the promise of Malachi (iii. 1), in the spirit and power of Elias, to make ready a prepared people. But in what manner? By turning, on one hand, the hearts of the fathers (of the better Pharisees perhaps) to the children, thus making a way for the divine stranger by opposing the traditions of the fathers; on the other hand, by turning the unbelieving (the better among the Sadducees) to the true wisdom of the just.

But how could Zacharias mistrust and contradict the word of the angel, whose message thus met his heart's deepest aspirations? At such moments, when the bestowal of a long-wished-for blessing, whose want he thought he had long ago got over, is announced to one who is resigned to God's dealings, and is declared to be now nigh at hand, all the sensibility of his soul is expressed in a sudden reaction. The peace of resignation has become so dear to him. He has felt himself so secure, so free, and proud in that deprivation which he has accepted from the hand of God as his lot in life, and he is unwilling to be thrown back into his former conflicts. Hence it generally happens that there is a remnant of bitter reminiscence still unexterminated in the depths of the heart. He had once felt

¹ John, Jehochanan, יְהוֹחָנָן, from יְהוָה, and חָנַן to be favourable to any one, to have mercy upon him, to present him with a gift.

² The Nazarite is properly the priestly prophet, one who represents his non-legal, free, sacred disposition or vocation to a certain priestliness by self-denial. As symbolical holiness in general was negatively a severance from the community, positively a consecration to Jehovah, so especially was that of the Nazarite. There were both male and female Nazarites. They abstained from wine, and all that came from the vine, and allowed the hair of their heads to grow. As the priest appears as a consecrated man at the summit of social life, so does the Nazarite appear as a consecrated one in a return to the heights of primitive life, or in the original vigour of natural life, which is a special means of nearness to God, for one who has a message from God in his heart.

himself injured by Providence, but he was constrained by his submission to God to oppose, to condemn, to deaden such a feeling. But now, amidst the surprising announcement, the smothered flame of his displeasure bursts forth once more. His various emotions produce a strong passion, a convulsive effort of mind, which seems to repel the promise. Thus did Abraham make objections, when Isaac was promised him; and Moses seemed no longer gladly willing, when he was at length commissioned to realize his youth's highest ideal, and to redeem Israel. Zacharias too manifests a similar emotion.

He had indeed reason to ask, How shall this be? for 'I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years.'

But instead of an explanation, he requests a fresh sign. 'Whereby shall I know this?'—the vision seeming to him an insufficient sign.¹

The same divine operation now makes a second and more powerful impression upon him.

His doubts are overpowered by the majesty of the divine vision, which appeared to him in a still clearer light. He now recognizes in this appearance the angel Gabriel, who stands before God (therefore the angel of the divine presence); and the reproof which thrills through his soul, for his mistrust of such a revelation, affects his whole being.

But it is asked, how could the angel inflict upon him the affliction of dumbness as a punishment to his unbelief? Was not this such a manifestation of passion, it is asked, as should not be supposed to exist in an angelic breast? And was not such treatment unjust, when compared with that which Mary and which Abraham experienced on similar occasions?²

We must first remember that here, as everywhere in the province of revelation, we have to do with facts, whose intention and exact significance is to be known by their results. In the present case, the fact was as follows: Zacharias became dumb as the result of the shock which the vision produced in his mind, and did not regain his speech till John had been born and received his name. He himself recognized in this fact the punishment of his sin; since, without the co-operation of his conscience, he would not have understood the word of the angel, which announced this chastisement.

There was also a difference between the expressions of Mary and Abraham and those of Zacharias. He found the sign, which was to be to him the pledge that the wondrous promise would be fulfilled, too small. But even if he had expressed himself exactly as Abraham did, the assertion of critics, that he ought then to experience treatment in no wise differing from that which Abraham experienced, must be attributed to an external and most formal casuistry. It is an old rule, that two persons may perform externally the same action, without that action having precisely the same moral import.³ Can the critic prove that the moral value of the question

¹ [Riggenbach (*Vorlesungen*, p. 164) says, 'Like the fleshly Jews he seeks a sign—and a sign is given him.'—ED.] ² See Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 4th edit. p. 115.

³ *Duo cum faciunt idem, non est idem.*

of Zacharias cannot possibly be different from that of Abraham? Might not one and the same question be, in the mouth of Abraham, an expression of most profound submission; in that of Mary, of purest maidenly solicitude; and in that of Zacharias, a question not free from the reviving elements of unbelief? We cannot help it if the casuist is insensible to the importance of the actual state of the inner life in producing this variety, but we need not long occupy ourselves with his 'difficulty.'¹

It can prove nothing against the historic reality of the late birth here announced, that similar late births were matters of promise in the Old Testament, as those of Isaac and Samuel.² This circumstance, on the contrary, points to a peculiarity in the divine government which is wont to call not merely the late-born, but frequently also the lost, the exposed, the greatly endangered, or the overlooked among children, and to form them into the chosen vessels of His providence. These form an extensive category, in which may be reckoned, according to legendary history, Romulus and Remus; according to the Old Testament, Isaac, Joseph, and Moses; and according to the New, John the Baptist and Christ.

Dumb, and speaking by signs, solemnized, yet filled with sacred joy, Zacharias came forth from the temple to bless the waiting people; dumb, but happy in the certainty of the promised blessing, he returned, after having fulfilled his ministry, to his home. His wife Elisabeth conceived. She lived for five months in strict retirement, a hermitess, already entering into the destination of her son by her own conduct; her soul reposing in the joyful feeling that the Lord had looked upon her, and taken away her reproach among women. It was amidst the noblest of Israelite aspirations that John was conceived, and that the day of his birth approached.

SECTION IV.

THE VIRGIN MARY.

(Luke i.; Matt. i.)

It was six months after Elisabeth, the mother of the promised forerunner of Messiah, had conceived, that the second and greater

¹ It is moreover mere assumption, that Sarah's state of mind (Gen. xviii. 12) remained unpunished, when censure is elsewhere called punishment. The measure in which punishment was meted out to her, would perhaps have been more explicitly stated if she had been the principal character. It is only the caricature of an ultra-superfine mind to say that Abraham, according to Gen. xvii. 17, 'found the divine promise laughably incredible.' That, moreover, a distinction between the guilt of such sinful thoughts as die or are suppressed in the heart, and such as are expressed in words, is not blasphemy, as Bruno Bauer supposes (*Kritik*, vol. i. p. 33), need not be first explained. If any one represses a smile which may arise in his mind at the mysteries of revelation, and does not suffer it to appear, he has spared himself the greater offence. It is moreover false to say that Mary, according to Luke i. 34, asked exactly the same question as Zacharias. Mary inquired after the manner, Zacharias required a sign of the fact, a sign beyond the appearing of the angel.

² See Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 132.

manifestation of the theocratic Spirit of God took place. Mary, the Israelite maiden of Nazareth, the betrothed of Joseph, received the heavenly message. The angel Gabriel appeared to her, and brought her the message that she was to be the mother of the Messiah.

This wonderful event is a rhythm of the mutual action which took place between the highest and most glorious influences of the theocratic Spirit of God, and the most elevated and holiest frame of that elect soul, who was to be the starting-point of a new and higher creation. The majesty of that power of God which was bringing grace, and founding the kingdom of salvation, suddenly appears before her mind in a holy hour of prayer as a bright vision. She experiences the first effect of this manifestation; the word of God, from the mouth of the angel, that she is highly favoured of God, the elect among all women, resounds through her soul. Hence, the first word of the message is a greeting from God, in which her reconciliation, her peace with God, and her high vocation are assured to her. The blessed and glad surprise of the assurance of her eternal election penetrates her whole being.

But scarcely was this experience vouchsafed unto her, than her soul was troubled to its depths. In the surprise of humility, she was unable to understand the meaning of the salutation: she cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. She thus confirmed its effect, and made way for the second part of this message. Another and still brighter effulgence of the revealing power of God follows upon this humble fear. It is answered, and assured to her, that the highest blessing in Israel is destined to her, that she is to bring forth the Messiah. The angel already calls Him, and her rejoicing heart also calls Him, *Jesus, the help of God, the salvation of God*. He stands before her soul in His glory, the Son of the Most High. His form is justly Israelite: He appears as the royal son of David, who is to possess the throne of His father. But His nature is Christ-like: His kingdom is eternal; a kingdom which will develop itself in the infinity of the Divine Spirit is promised Him.¹ Lost in the heartfelt aspirations of pure love, she contemplates Him whom she is to bring forth. All the longings of Israel, nay, of humanity, for the divine-human Lord and Saviour, for Him who was to be the honour of the human race, kindle within her heart, and her whole soul is dissolved in desires after Him,

¹ It is hardly necessary to enter into the general assumption of criticism, that a promise or description of Messiah is circumscribed by Jewish narrowness because it appears in the costume and colouring of Israelite Messianism. For this assumption everywhere proceeds from the view that these descriptions can be only understood in a carnal and pharisaically narrow sense, while in fact they were understood by all the genuine children of the Israelite spirit in their symbolical, or rather their ideal-real signification, in which also it was that they were uttered by the prophets. These critical notions presuppose that Christ could not be the Saviour of the world, in the conviction of the faithful Israelite. The measure in which the expressions of Old Testament Christology were understood and applied in a New Testament meaning, entirely depended on the individual degree of enlightenment of those who made use of these expressions. The Messianic idea of Mary must be regarded as essentially identical with the life of Christ Himself, since it became in her bosom the birth of Christ.

under the influence of the divine announcement sent to her from heaven.

But she feels that this Being, as the highest thought of God, His express image, His most glorious communication and gift, soars high above her. How can she become the mother of the Messiah—she the virgin? Not desponding doubt, but the enlightened inquiry of a clear understanding, expresses its helplessness in presence of the Eternal by this: How? Mary inquires, with a greatness and purity in which all maidenly bashfulness is absorbed, in which true maidenliness expresses itself in perfect liberty of mind: ‘How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?’¹ Then follows the third and most exalted operation of the divine manifestation. The Holy Spirit bears her spirit beyond the limits of the old aeon. She is baptized, in full inspiration, into the death of surrender to the dealings of God. Her development has now attained the climax of the earlier humanity. Painters rightly represent Gabriel as presenting to Mary the branch of lilies. The lily branch denotes her own life, in this perfect, inspired frame. ‘The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God!’ Thus that divine operation which she experiences sounds like a saying which enlightens her whole being. The Holy Ghost perfects her frame of mind, and the power of God completes, while this frame continues, that creative work whose result was the germination and production of the flower of the human race from her life, the lily flower from the lily branch. The Word becomes flesh.

Mary abides in the glory of God’s wonder-working power. She feels certain that Omnipotence is at hand, when Divine Grace and Truth make a promise. Assurance enters her soul as a distinct word of God: with God nothing shall be impossible.

Thus her glance is enlightened to penetrate the sphere of God’s wonder-working power. In this clear vision of the realm of the new revelation, her soul perceives her friend Elisabeth; it is announced to her that the childless and barren one has conceived.

Thus had the operation of God appointed and depicted her lot. She must have felt what was before her, while treading this path of miracle: how she might become an enigma to her betrothed husband; lose her honour in the eyes of the world, and be led into the very darkest path—a path of death to a Jewish virgin. But it was the Lord who had called her, and He could testify for her. She said, ‘Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy word.’ In God’s strength she quickly decided, ready even to enter upon the darkness of shame, though more painful to a maiden heart than death itself. And thus was she truly the mother of Jesus, of the hero of God, who endured the cross, despising

¹ [Ellicott (*Hist. Lect.* p. 49) calls this the question ‘of a childlike innocence that sought to realize to itself, in the very face of seeming impossibilities, the full assurance of its own blessedness.’—ED.]

the shame, and saved the world by His death upon the cross. Henceforth God is to be her fame. But the abrupt manner in which her words break off, her deep silence, is very significant. She was absorbed in the contemplation not only of the glory, but of the deathlike sternness of her destiny.

Human nature had in its religious development, in its pressure towards the light, under the leading of the Spirit of God, now attained that wondrous height, which formed the centre of its historical, the end of its natural, the beginning of its spiritual course. As its first æon, the æon of natural life, had begun with a miracle, so its second or spiritual æon could not but proceed from a miracle. In other words, it must proceed from a truly new principle, a principle breaking through the old æon, with the superior force of a higher grade.

The Gospel announcement of the miraculous descent of Christ from the Virgin was opposed by all contemporaries whose theories of inspiration were infected by an Ebionite mutilation, and sometimes passed over, or but slightly touched upon, even by more orthodox theologians. There is, however, no reason for thus treating this doctrine, though fear of the profanation which this holy mystery so soon incurs from common minds might induce us rather to defend it than to bring it prominently forward. They who do not hold it in its connection with all the essential doctrines of Christianity, and a thoroughly christological view of life and of the world, and they who do not cherish it, in the simplicity of childlike faith, as the most glorious, the central miracle of the world's history, cannot profit by it. But it is one thing not to bring this dogma prominently forward, and quite another to doubt or reject it. Its positive denial robs every other doctrine of Christianity of its full value. Neither the death of Christ nor His resurrection can be known in their whole significance, if His birth is positively misconceived. In this case, there is a crack in the bell, and its pure, full, penetrating sound is gone.

The discovery was thought to have been made, that this doctrine was non-essential, as being insufficient for its purpose. This arose, however, from the assumption, that it was set up by the Christian Church, for the purpose of representing the life of Christ as free from original sin, by reason of His miraculous birth. The sagacious remark was consequently made, that the removal of male instrumentality in the origin of a human being did not suffice to prevent his hereditary sinfulness, since there was still the instrumentality of the sinful mother, and the influence of her sinfulness upon the life of her child.¹ This line of argument might indeed be of im-

¹ See Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 183; Schleiermacher, *der christl. Glaube*, vol. ii. p. 67. Although Schleiermacher pronounces the view, that male instrumentality was set aside in the generation of the Redeemer, insufficient for its intended purpose, and therefore superfluous, yet he seeks to maintain a higher operation, 'which as a divine and creative agency was able, even if the generation were a perfectly natural one, so to change both the paternal and maternal influence that no sinfulness should be inherited.' [On the question whether nativity from a virgin does of itself secure freedom

portance, if the assumption were a correct one. But the question is not, what is the result of a dogma? but, what are we taught concerning one of the great original facts of Christianity? and this sagacious argument looks, by the side of this teaching, something like a child by the side of a man whose knee he barely reaches.

This doctrine has been attacked by the remark, that the earlier expressions of the Evangelists concerning it are not borne out by the Gospels, in which, on the contrary, Jesus is often designated the son of Joseph¹ (Luke ii. 41, 48, iv. 22; Matt. xiii. 55; John vi. 42). It seems, then, to be required that, in Christ's life, those duties which sons and step-sons owe to their parents, as such, should be omitted. It would certainly be acting in a strictly dogmatical manner thus, in compliance with the requisition of critics, to sacrifice the due expression of filial respect to a doctrinal form.

Nay, it has been required that Jesus should have appealed to His miraculous origin, when the Jews spoke of His lowly condition. This requisition, however, need only be mentioned; its true value cannot be unappreciated by any candid mind.²

But when it is asserted that this doctrine is found in none of the writings of the apostles, except in the Gospel tradition of the childhood of Jesus, such an assertion can only be explained upon the supposition of a most imperfect acquaintance with the signification of those genuine christological definitions which so frequently recur in the New Testament.³ John clearly enough defines the miraculous origin of Christ, when he says, chap. i. 14: 'The Word was made flesh.' On the assumption of the natural descent of Jesus from Joseph and Mary, he could at most have said, The Word came in the flesh; but that the Word Himself should have become flesh, denotes a creative incident; the miraculous entrance of the all-embracing idea, in the concrete manifestation, the complete identity of the Eternal Word and human flesh, in the element of a new life.

from sin, Witsius (*De Econ. Fed.* II. iv. 11) contents himself with quoting two diverse opinions. Mästricht says, it behoved the second Adam to be in the first Adam *natur-aliter sed non fœderaliter*, that is, to belong to our race, and yet to be free in His own person from the consequences of the fall; and this he thinks was accomplished by His birth from the Virgin. It seems obvious from Scripture that His extraordinary generation conferred on Him at once all that is conferred on others by regeneration. He was not born of the will of man, but of the will of God, and was therefore wholly pure from sin. It is difficult to see how this could otherwise have been effected. Young (*Christ of History*, 264) says:—'It would have been incongruous, even offensive, had He not been thus physically separated from all of human kind.' An interesting chapter on this subject occurs in Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* (ii. 8), in which he takes occasion to state that there are four modes in which God can make man,—'aut de viro et de femina, sicut assiduus usus monstrat; aut nec de viro nec de femina, sicut creavit Adam; aut de viro sine femina, sicut fecit Eam; aut de femina sine viro.'—[En.]

¹ The assertion, found also in Schleiermacher, that even the genealogies oppose the earlier accounts of the Evangelists, 'by simply and inartificially referring to Joseph, without any respect to these statements,' must be designated a false one, with respect to Matt. i. 16 and Luke iii. 23. In the former, the ever-recurring 'begat' (*ἐγένεντος*) is not repeated in the case of Joseph; in the latter, 'being the son of Joseph' is qualified by the words, 'as was supposed' (*ὡς ἐνοπίζετο*).

² Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 185.

³ Schleiermacher, *der christliche Glaube*, ii. 25; Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 185.

No doubt can exist of the import of this deeply significant saying, when we hear Jesus (chap. iii. 6) lay down the rule : That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit ; and make (ver. 3) the being born again of the Spirit the condition of entrance into the kingdom of heaven to all men who, as flesh, are born of the flesh.¹ The son of Joseph could only have become a prophet of God by being born again, and could not have been the Redeemer born in the flesh ; nor could it have been said of Him (ver. 30), He that cometh from above, is above all. The Apostle Paul, too, undoubtedly refers to the same fact, when he represents Christ (1 Cor. xv. 47) as the man from heaven.² He agrees with John in proclaiming the miraculous origin of Christ. The Christology of both is clear and decided, and raised, even in its first incident, above every Ebionite misconception. Paul represents this man, who is the Lord from heaven, as the second man, in decided contrast to the first man, who is of the earth, earthly. He is the heavenly counterpart to the earthly man, the second Adam ; He was consequently made a quickening spirit, as Adam was a living soul (ver. 45). Thus even in His origin He was the second man, as Adam was the first. Had He become man in the usual course of the Adamic generations, He must have been attributed, collectively with the whole race, to the first man, to Adam. But it was that which was new, which was miraculous in His origin, it was His actual origination from the life of the Spirit, which made Him the second man. The statement of the apostle is, under this aspect, not merely an announcement, it is also a proof of the mystery in question. The review of Cerinthus, that it is an impossibility, has of late been repeated with approbation.³ It is said that such a generation would be the most striking departure from every law of nature,⁴ and again that we must not indeed, even in a Christian point of view, confound the notion of a wonder with that of a miracle. A wonder is the effect of a new principle of life at its first appearance in a pre-existing and subordinate sphere of life, an effect produced by some sort of means. A miracle, on the contrary, is doubly contrary to nature, monstrous, and therefore only a fictitious wonder. On one side, it is deficient in means or historical proof ; on the other, in dynamic foundation or ideal proof. It must, therefore, certainly be considered a miracle, that a human being should, in the midst of the Adamic generations, be born without paternal generation ; and in opposition to such a fiction, it might always be remarked, that God never works superfluous wonders. It must, indeed, be granted that the first human beings originated without natural generation, but that, when once the way of generation had been ordained of God, the coming of a human being was

¹ Compare Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 17.

² Οὕτω καὶ γέγραπται, Ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν· ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. Ἀλλ' οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικόν ἐπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν. Ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος ἐκ γῆς χούκες· ὁ δεύτερος ἀνθρώπος ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. Vers. 45-47.

³ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 182.

⁴ *Id.* p. 181.

not to be expected in any other manner. The plant, *e.g.*, begins, so to speak, with a wonder in its origin, in the seed, or in the root; but when its development has once begun, the stock continues advancing in regular progression according to law, till it reaches its destined height. Then, however, something new appears, viz., the blossom, the wonder of the summit, corresponding to the wonder in the ground. The blossom is not to be compared to a miracle, but to a wonder. There is an adequate cause for it, but, at the same time, plant-life appears therein as a new, and often an ennobled and elevated principle. It is not enough to say of this wonder, it *might* happen, for it is in the very nature of the plant that it *must* happen. It was thus also that the tree of human nature, according to the profound hint of the Apostle Paul, shot upwards from the dark earth toward heaven,—the wonder in the ground, the root of the race, Adam, corresponding to the wonder of the summit, of the development of the race, entering into a spiritual and heavenly life, the flower of the humian race, even Christ.

When we consider that the second man appeared during the later stage of human life as the climax of the whole organism, as the counterpart to the first man who was its foundation, we obtain a harmonious and exclusive view, plainly bearing within itself a character of internal necessity. It may be indeed inconvenient to gaze upwards to this exalted height of humanity; uncomfortable to acknowledge that the second man, the principle of the world's end, has already appeared in our midst; difficult to suppose that humanity has already reached the highest point of its religious development, while its branches still spread abroad in such rank luxuriance; but it is really far more difficult to expose our view of the future lot of the human race to the supposition of an 'evil' endlessness, to ignore the unity of the race in its development, and to reject the announcement of the close of this development in its consummation, in the one individuality which presents the phenomenon of the divine life in the human. The flower of humanity has unfolded itself in the climate of God's presence;¹ it has received the fulness of His life, and now pours forth the same for ever, in order to consecrate by its blessing the wild plant, and to ennable it for life in heaven. As the first man originated, without father and without mother, from that creative agency of God which spiritualized the dust of the earth, so did the second man originate without father, by that effectual power of the Most High which spiritualized humanity.²

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 47; John i. 18, iii. 13.

² The passage, Gal. iv. 4, in which Christ is represented as made of a woman, is said to contribute nothing to the doctrine of His miraculous descent. Certainly the being 'made of a woman' may express merely the humanity, and even the weakness of man, as, *e.g.*, Job xiv. 1. But the definition here obtains a meaning of its own, from its connection with the words: when the fulness of the time was come (*τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*), God sent forth His Son. For when the apostle further designates Him who was sent, as *γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικός*, this is certainly an expression for that culminating point, which was to appear in the fulness of the time, as the conclusion of the old æon. To say that the fulness of the time had arrived, was to say that a new vital principle had appeared. The actual instrument of its introduction

Generation is certainly an honourable and noble form of human origin ; nevertheless, being in itself only a function of natural life, its result can be only a natural one, *i.e.*, an unspiritualized, undefied human life.¹ It is capable of sinking below the level of innocence, and in its rudeness and wildness might lay the foundation of a ruder and more savage form of human life. It does not, however, exclude the influences of the Spirit, and can even, under its consecrations, receive continually increasing light.² The Franciscans have represented the consecration of origin amidst which Mary entered the world, in the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin—a dogma which is the true type of a mediaeval myth.

Mary issued from the theocratic race, which was consecrated by the Spirit, at the time when it had attained its highest development. In her person, the mutual penetration of flesh and spirit, the consecration of matter, had attained its highest power ; and it was under such conditions that the birth of ‘that holy thing,’ in which the Word was to become flesh, took place. But the form of generation, even at the climax of its consecration, is not to be placed on a level with the formation of a human being taking place in the pure element of human inspiration, under the agency of the divine power. That inspiration of Mary, under which Christ was conceived and born, is represented as a permanent elevation of mind ; hence her song of praise is not introduced, like that of Zacharias, with the words : She was filled with the Holy Ghost. She was continually filled with the Holy Ghost in these glorious days of her

into the world was the consecrated woman ; in His ideal descent, He is the Son of God. But this new man subjected Himself to the law of the old human nature, in order to elevate it to His own Sonship. So far does the expression *γενόμενον ὑπὸ νομοῦ* (made under the law) form a contrast to *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός* (made of a woman).

¹ As then we have opposed that which seems to us the supernatural in the person of the Redeemer, so also natural generation, as being an act of the procreative power of human nature, through the joint instrumentality of the sexes, has been declared insufficient to account for His origin.’ Schleiermacher, *der christl. Glaube*, vol. ii. p. 66.

² The doctrine, that human nature is consecrated by the influence of the Spirit—that a still more mighty hereditary blessing was opposed to the hereditary curse, is evident even in the promise of the woman’s seed (Gen. iii. 15), and in the blessing of Noah (Gen. ix. 26, 27), but especially in the grant which Abraham received, that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed (Gen. xxii. 14). This frequently recurs both in the Old and New Testaments ; *e.g.*, Isa. lxv. 20, 23 ; 1 Cor. vii. 14. The most heterogeneous minds, Talmudists and modern poets, concur in the assertion of this truth. The Rabbis taught (comp. Zelpke, *die Jugendschichte des Herrn*, p. 47) : ‘Omnis illi qui sciunt se sanctificare, ut par est (ubi generant) attrahunt super id spiritum sanctitatis et exuentur ab eo illi vocantur filii Jehovae. Ea hora, qua filius hominis se sanctificat ad copulandum se cum conjugi confilio sancto, datur super eum spiritus aliis, plene sanctus.’ And Göthe uttered the significant lines :—

Man konnte erzogene Kinder gebären
Wenn die Ältern selber erzogen wären.

Had the modern Church as diligently cherished the doctrine of the inherited blessing, as it has that of the inherited curse, it might have far more successfully encountered many attacks, especially the dogma of Anabaptism. For the great prejudice of this sect consists in its denial of the Lord’s work in the very depths of human nature, His blessing in the line of Christian generation, by a rude and abstract application of the doctrine of hereditary sin.

visitation. Our due estimation of the uniqueness of Christ's origin depends on our appreciation of the contrast which such a state of inspiration presents to what is obscure, enslaved, and often selfish in ordinary generation.¹ Natural generation not only always entails an incongruence between flesh and spirit, such as must be shown to be annulled in the principle of Christianity, but must result in a particularity in the being begotten, such as must not appear in the new spiritual head of mankind. Not to mention the contamination of disease derived from their natural life, the curse of an evil disposition in their blood inherited in his blood, each descendant receives from his father and mother, through the reception into his own life of a proportion of the several partialnesses of theirs, a character which is both limited and infected with peculiarities; hence he can be but a single member in the organism of humanity, nay, he must be such; and it is with reference to this his destination that his peculiar gift, his province, his virtue exists. But for this very reason, no mere son of Joseph could, as the head of mankind, include the whole race. None but the Son of Mary, conceived by the divine operation, could, as the Son of man, become the spiritual head of humanity.²

With the birth of this second man, the first æon of the human race, that of natural human life, terminated, and its second æon, that of spiritual human life, began. The opponents of the doctrine of the miraculous birth of Christ cannot comprehend this idea, because they do not comprehend the general sublimity of reality, the ascending series of reality, the succession of æons which are ever exhibiting increasingly glorious spheres of life and manifestations of God's power. According to their view, we are now in the midst of that course of unalterable conformity to law, on the part of nature and of life, which is utterly unsusceptible of modification. The progress of natural laws is like an immeasurable railroad, without beginning or end. We ourselves are in the train, without remembrance of the beginning or hope of the end, and they who should alight would be crushed by the inexorable wheels. Such monotony and necessity is, however, no faithful type of the world of the Christian, nay, not even of the world of the geologist, who has a faint glimmer of the æon, in the relation of the present world to that insular primitive world in which gigantic amphibia, perhaps the ancient dragons and griffins, grotesquely sported among the marshy primitive islands. A second and higher form of life then appeared in place of the first, and geologists allow us a better prospect of a third than many theologians. It is upon the massive and firm basis of a succession of æons that the New Testament develops its plan of the world. This is entirely æonic in its nature.

¹ Comp. Nitzsch, *System of Christian Doctrine*, p. 330 (Clark's Tr.)

² This truth flashed upon Bruno Bauer, in a passage of his early review of Strauss's *Leben Jesu*, in the *Berl. Jahrbuch*, cited by Krabbe in his lectures on the *Leben Jesu*, p. 71; and even though his announcement of it is defective in scholastic formulæ, yet this exposition cannot be called, as Krabbe insists, philosophical nonsense. Comp. Hanne, *Rationalismus und spek. Theol.*, p. 96.

It soars on eagles' wings towards heaven, and does not travel by the railroad of a mechanical philosophy along an interminable plain. The æon is a period of creation produced by and developing a new principle which forms its rhythm; it is the inner clock, the spring which is in all that is developed in vital progression. This period is at the same time an eternity, a special manifestation of the eternal. The æon begins with a principle which in a miraculous manner breaks through, seizes, and elevates into its own higher life, the former æonically developed sphere of life. Thus Adam was the principle of the first æon of mankind; thus Christ was that of the second. To him, therefore, who can rise to the æon doctrine of the New Testament, the reason of Christ's miraculous birth will be manifest.

Even the heathen had some notions of this miracle, because they had an obscure perception of hereditary curse and inherited blessing, of desecrating or consecrating generation. They dreamed in significant myths of the Son of the Virgin; Hercules and Romulus, Pythagoras and Plato, as well as many others, were esteemed sons of gods. These dreams were types of the Coming One.¹ When Isaiah spoke of the Virgin's Son, whom he represented as a sign from God to his unbelieving sovereign (Isa. vii. 14), he expressed in his prophetic saying concerning the virginity of the mother and the consecration of her Son, who was to be called Immanuel, the mystery of that spiritual consecration of births, whose perfected fruit was to appear in the birth of Jesus. Many relatively virgin, that is, theocratically consecrated births, were to form the ascending series by which the miraculous birth of Christ was brought about. More and more virgin-like were the dispositions in which the noblest daughters of the theocracy became mothers; more and more divinely consecrated were the sons, who might be considered the produce of the most elevated theocratic dispositions; and ever more and more were these, the noblest children of Israel, conceived and born amidst the aspirations and hopes of their mothers to bring forth the Messiah, or at least a preliminary Messiah, a hero of God anointed with the Spirit. This was the consecration to whose working in Israel Isaiah referred, when he made the virgin-mother a sign of deliverance, and fore-appointed for her new-born son the name of Immanuel. At the termination of this continual consecration which took place along the line of Israel, the Virgin and her Son were to appear.

NOTES.

1. To avoid a partial view of the origin of spiritual, vital phenomena, it is needful always to distinguish between their historical

¹ Compare Neander, *Life of Christ*, 18. Remarks opposed to this view, as, e.g., those of Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 203, are noticed in the First Book of this work, under the title, Ideality of the Gospel History. [See also on the virgin-born Budh, and other virgin-births of the East, in Kitto's *Bible Illustr.*, *Life of our Lord*, pp. 80-94.—ED.]

and ideal origin. Every individual has his historic origin in his genealogy (Traducianism); his ideal origin in the direct realization of the divine idea of his life (Creatianism).¹ According to the former, an individual is a result of an infinite series of causes; according to the latter, a new and isolated being, a new divine thought, a singularity, destined, as an individual, to become, as a person, a celebrity. It is the historic origin of Christ with which we have hitherto been occupied. His antecedents begin in paradise. Christ is the seed of the woman, the express image of God, the development of that which had been defined as the image of God in the disposition of the first man. Religion is the first and most general form of the coming of Christ; God manifests Himself in man, man lays hold on God. But this piety on the part of man was at first uncaused, and consequently uncertain. Religion was shaken, obscured, and rendered for the most part passive, by the fall. It retained, however, a fundamental feature of activity. This became dead in Abraham. Man again laid hold on God in His word; God again called man by his faith. This was the second form of the coming of Christ, or the first stage of Christology in fallen humanity, the era of the promise. Then followed the era of the law. In the law, the mediator-prophet traced for the covenant people the first lineaments of Christ's life;—in the moral law, the lineaments of His deeds; in the ceremonial, the lineaments of His sufferings. The law pronounced a curse upon the transgressor, and thereby prophesied a blessing in the Coming One, who would perfectly conform to it. It was placed over the people, but its essence lay in the life of the people. Nor did this essence consist alone in the prophet who was the mediator of the covenant, but also in the covenant feeling of the people, and the covenant dealings of God with them. Thus was the era of the prophets introduced. This was the era of the commencement of the real incarnation of God in His people. The covenant people shone with the brightness of the increase (*Werden*) of Christ among them, that is, in the inspired frames and announcements of their prophets. The flower had fully expanded, but now the blossom vanished, and the silent period of the formation of fruit followed. The theocratic life began, as an inner life, to seize upon and penetrate the people to its very core, and the period of popular christological life, especially under the Maccabees, appeared. Finally, the last stage of historic instrumentality occurred, the stage of the concentration of the christological formation in the life of Mary.

Without an appreciation of this historic instrumentality, we cannot attain to a clear recognition of the conformity to law manifested in the miraculous element of the life of Christ. We should, however, be entangled in misunderstandings of equal importance, by losing

¹ [Traducianism is the doctrine (maintained by Tertullian as being favourable to the doctrine of original sin) that the soul is propagated per traducem, just as the body is. Creatianism, on the contrary, maintains that every human soul is created as such, and united with the body in the womb.—ED.]

sight of the ideal in the historic origin of Christ. According to His ideal origin, He is not the Son of David, but the Son of God. In Him, the express image of God, the fulness of His being is manifested. The Son of God is, with reference to the Father, the expression, the character (Heb. i. 3) of His being ; with reference to the world, the motive for which it was produced (Col. i. 15, 16), according to the ideal significance of its nature ; with reference to the relation between God and the world, the Logos, the Word in which the revelation of God and the spiritual enlightenment of the world is clearly expressed. Christian dogmatism has sought clearly to express the ideality of Christ's origin, by decidedly holding that the divine Word did not take the person, but the nature of man. See Hase, *Lehrbuch der evang. Dogmatik*, p. 272. The decisions arrived at are in accordance with Scripture, in so far as they are calculated to exclude human limitation, speciality, and partialness from the individuality of Christ ; but inasmuch as they trench too much upon His human individuality, they are akin to Monophysitism.

2. The Evangelist Matthew (chap. i. 22) refers the passage Isa. vii. 14, concerning the Virgin and her Son Immanuel, to the birth of Christ, with the words : 'All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel ; which, being interpreted, is God with us.' For discussions on this passage, see Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 174. For its right understanding, it is necessary first to obtain a due estimate of the historical import and occasion of these words. Isaiah is giving a sign that the Lord will deliver the land from the attacks of the kings of Israel and Syria. He gives the sign to the house of David, after it had been hypocritically deprecated by king Ahaz, that the 'virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name God with us ;' and adds, that 'before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.' It cannot be misunderstood that Isaiah is here speaking of a child who was to be born in the immediate future. The rejoicing of the land in this future is denoted by two incidents. First, the virgin, as soon as her child is born, shall express the disposition of the best in the land by the name she will give to her son : *God with us!* And then, when the child begins to awaken to moral consciousness, all danger will have disappeared. The rationalistic critic, however, insists upon making this immediate reference the exclusive one ; and he thus explains the sign : 'Prosaically expressed, before nine months have elapsed, the condition of the land shall be more hopeful, and within about three years the danger will have disappeared.' The reference to Jesus, it is subsequently said, is pressed upon the prophet by the Evangelist (Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 180). The 'prosaic' explainer should not have forgotten that history is quite peculiar in Israel. First, it is worthy of remark, that the prophet turns from the unbelieving individual, and speaks to the house of David. Then

the sign is at all events strangely chosen. The young woman (*עלמה*) in question is still a virgin, or at any rate has not yet conceived. Now it is fore-announced, (1) that she shall conceive, (2) that she shall bear a son, and (3) that she shall have the theocratic courage to call his name Immanuel. The choice of such a sign must certainly be regarded as Messianic, by those who clearly perceive the difference between Messianic types and prophecies. The theocrat, filled as his mind is with anticipations, unconsciously forms prophetic types; for it certainly accords with the progress of that life which was perfected in Christ, that the sprouting leaf should unconsciously prophesy of the coming flower. The highest kind of types are those typical frames of mind found in the Messianic psalms, and to this class the present passage undoubtedly belongs. Prophecies, strictly so called, are conscious predictions; the more general kind are unconscious, yet nevertheless prophecies in types. First of all, the Alma, the Israelite virgin, who by her theocratic consecration carries virginity into marriage, is significant. This incident is that which is properly typical, the very nerve of the passage; it is ethic virginity, which in its progress brings to maturity the salvation of Israel. The next is a *prediction*: she shall bear a son. The third belongs to prophecy strictly so called: she shall call him, God with us. The courage of that period shall be manifested by her disposition. Rightly did Matthew perceive the fulfilment of this prophetic and presentient expression, when the Virgin Mary brought forth the Son that had been promised her in a stable, amidst the machinations of Herod, and had the courage, in spite of the circumstances under which he was born, to call His name *Jesus: the help of God, the salvation of God*. (Comp. my work *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter der kanon. Evangelien*, p. 62.)

3. With respect to the psychology of the matter in question, theology is as little bound to explain the origin of Christ in the spiritualization of His mother, as the origin of Adam in the spiritualization of the earth. The striking natural analogies which occur in the usual course of nature are of a morbid kind. Physicians have spoken of a 'fœtus formation, or growth of a human embryo, in a male or immature female body.' See Hamburger, *Entwurf eines naturl. Systems der Medizin*, p. 368. 'The sufficiency of a single individual for procreation is a law with the lower animals, and cannot therefore be directly denied to the higher. Hence such sufficiency must certainly be an internal property with them:' p. 369.

SECTION V.

MARY AND ELISABETH.

(Matt. i.; Luke i.)

Astrologers, in their superstitious enthusiasm for remote and subtle influences in nature, were wont to say much of the influence

of the stars upon the births and fates of men. There are, however, stars which have the greatest influence upon the lives of those who are about to see the light of day, namely, the dispositions of their mothers. In this respect, we are justified in asserting that Jesus was born under the happiest star. Mary's frame of mind seems to have been a wonderfully elevated one, a continuous inspiration. This inspiration, however, was, in conformity with its circumstances, of the profoundest kind. The saintly pallor of priestly melancholy, and the joyful glow of royal victory, successively lit up her sacred countenance. The experiences of the mother under whose heart the Lord lay were so peculiar, and called forth such states of mind, that the holy vibration of her soul between deepest sorrow and sublimest joy, could not but communicate to His temperament the purest seriousness and the profoundest happiness, blended in the wondrous harmony of a most sacred disposition.

Mary had surrendered and entrusted herself to the care of God in the great hour of her visitation. She was afterwards assured in spirit that she was a mother. It was impossible, however, for her to conceal her experience from her betrothed, the carpenter Joseph. At all events, she could not leave Nazareth for months without discovering her condition to him. She might thereby have led him to misinterpret the reason of her journey, and have deceived him. In her peculiar situation, it seemed, moreover, a simple moral duty to initiate him into the mystery ; nay, to give him up, in case he could not share her faith. The communication would naturally be a test at a critical moment, a test of his faith.

Joseph refused to believe her. He encountered the modest, but unshakeably firm virgin with decided doubt ; the first Ebionite. He was, however, far more excusable than his successors, who reject all the testimony of God to the glory of Christ's origin. If he were to stand by Mary, he must be able to answer for her ; for this, however, he needed direct testimony from God. At all events, he would not receive her without such authentication. The only thing he conceded, was an alleviation of the form of separation. According to Israelite law, a betrothed man was obliged to honour his betrothed as a wife, if he desired to separate from her. He might not put her away without giving her a writing of divorce. In giving this writing of divorce, he had, however, the choice between two forms. He might therein state the reasons for which he put away his wife, might state her guilt, and thereby expose her to public shame ; or he might keep his reasons to himself, and thus put her away without reproach. Joseph was a just man, and decided upon the latter form of putting Mary away. The words, *he was a just man*, are usually taken to mean, *he was a kind one*. But this is unconsciously to assume that, in every case, extreme harshness is extreme justice ; a false assumption. If Joseph would have put Mary away without reproach because he was just, we learn from this circumstance that he had a tender conscience, and could not dare publicly to accuse Mary as guilty. In the inmost depths

of his heart her image found an advocate ; it had acquired a veneration which now raised a doubt against his suspicions. Hence he could only say that he would have nothing to do with her ; but his feeling of justice prevented him from accusing her. The gloss which would here give to the word *just* the sense of *kind*, destroys the whole point of the narrative. The Virgin did not need to entreat from Joseph's compassion that he should put her away without reproach, she could expect it from his justice ; and it was precisely his delicate perception of what was just in this case, which made his justice so honourable.¹

Mary then stood alone. Mistaken and rejected by her betrothed, she had the prospect of bringing up her child amidst the scorn of the Nazarenes, which would, in her position, be abundantly bestowed upon her, even if Joseph dismissed her without reproach. The most tender maidenly feeling that ever blushed upon a human countenance, was threatened with unlimited misconception and disgrace. But her heart was firm ; she had offered up her life to God ; she was sure of His guidance and assistance. Under her circumstances, however, she could not continue in Nazareth. It was the effect of the promise which was gladdening her soul, that turned her desires towards the hill country of Judah. Upon its heights a light was shining for her : her kinswoman Elisabeth, with whose wonderful condition she was acquainted. If there were yet one being on earth who would not misconceive and reject her, it must be Elisabeth, who had been called by the Lord as well as herself. Following, therefore, the impulse of her heart, Mary set out for the hills of Judah. They who have felt the rapid transition from unspeakable sorrow to peace, in a soul which must bring before God, and merge in God's appointment, its whole world, its very life ; they who have, in some decisive moment of their life, felt that nameless and blessed melancholy or godly sorrow, whose emblem is the white rose,—can form some idea of the disposition in which the lonely and rejected Mary, so poor, and yet so rich in the happy secret of her heart, took her journey of about four days towards her longed-for destination. This journey was not perhaps entirely in accordance with the forms of Old Testament decorum ; but the reality of the cross she bore, bestowed upon her a New

¹ [It ought here to be observed, that the order of events here proposed by the author has been approved by few, if any, but Rickenbach (p. 169). It is scouted with his usual vehemence by Tischendorf, who says (*Syn. Eran. præf. xxi.*) : 'Falsissimum esse Langii interpretationem verborum, Matt. i. 18, unde ipsam Mariam Josepho rem communicasse concludit, jam recte docuit Ebrardus.' But Ebrard himself seems to be as far wrong as Lange, for, founding on the traditional law that virgins were never allowed to travel, he supposes that her journey to the hill country did not take place till after her marriage. Lichtenstein (*Lebensgeschichte J. C.* p. 77) questions whether this law applied to virgins betrothed, and very justly appeals to Luke i. 56 in proof that on her return it was still her own and not Joseph's house she went to. Every unprejudiced reader would infer from Luke i. 39 that Mary's visit to Elisabeth immediately followed the annunciation, no event of importance intervening (certainly not such things as Ebrard supposes). She went 'in haste' to her natural adviser, her female relative. See the sensible and delicate remarks of Ellicott (*Hist. Lect.* 51). —ED.]

Testament liberty. Nothing can make a man bear more proudly and firmly the world's misjudgment, than the consciousness of that highest honour, the bearing of reproach for God's sake. It was under great and heavy anxiety of mind that Mary hastened towards her destination, like a ship, threatened with tempest, setting full sail for the harbour. Upon this journey she would pass the hill of Golgotha. The nearer she drew to the dwelling of the aged priest, the more must the question have arisen in her heart: Will thy innocence and thy faith here find an asylum; wilt thou here find a heart that understands thy vocation and thy way?

We are not surprised that her salutation should burst from her overburdened heart at her very entry, and seek out her friend in her house. It was the cry of need, or rather the painful exclamation of excited confidence yearning for love, with which the misunderstood Virgin sought for a welcome from her friend, the urgent demand of the highly exalted suppliant for the sympathy of a consecrated and initiated heart, a heart which could believe the miracle. Certainly a special electric force of sorrow and of faith lay in this exclamation. Elisabeth knew the voice before she saw Mary; she felt the shock of its tones, her child leaped beneath her leaping heart, she understood her friend's frame of mind, and felt what kind of welcome she stood in need of.

The outpouring of the Spirit, in which Mary was living, came upon her soul, and she exclaimed with a loud voice: 'Blessed art thou among women! and blessed is the fruit of thy womb! And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. And blessed is she that believed: for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord.'

To every messenger of God, who has at any time some great message, some instruction, or announcement from God to bring, the misconception which he has generally to endure at first is a heavy trial. It is difficult to maintain the heart's assurance of a revelation, which has as yet obtained no citizenship in the world, against the antipathy of the world and the reproach of fanaticism. Hence the first echo of recognition, of acknowledgment, which the misunderstood prophet finds in the world, is to his heart like a greeting from heaven, a seal of his assurance, a sacrament. Thus was Mary now raised, as it were, by the greeting of her friend, from the depths of the grave to heaven. The joy of faith, so long repressed by sadness and sore anxiety, burst forth, and she rejoiced aloud in a glad song of praise.¹ 'My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. For He hath regarded the lowliness of His handmaiden.' Thus does she begin, and then her song of

¹ If the Evangelist here makes no remark upon Mary's state of mind, as he did upon that of Elisabeth, this testifies to his sense for the delicate distinctions involved in the actual event. For Mary's state of mind, from the period of the conception, was a constant dwelling in the fulness of the Holy Spirit.

praise streams forth in announcements which may be regarded as expressive of the form which the Gospel had attained in her heart.

All men receive one and the same Gospel. And yet the Gospel is different to each, and takes a special form from the disposition and circumstances of each individual. When the atonement is viewed and represented only in its generality, without taking into account its reference to the actual state of the individual man, *i.e.*, to the manner in which it annuls the special curse of his life, the Gospel is made an abstraction, and is not viewed in the fulness of its results. It is highly instructive and elevating to see how the Gospel, at the very beginning of the New Testament, assumes in each redeemed soul the aspect of a special glory. To Simeon, the atonement becomes the assurance of a happy departure; while the aged Anna forsakes her solitude, and goes about as an evangelist among the pious in Jerusalem. It is with true womanly feeling that Mary says: ‘All generations shall call me blessed.’ But this is not because of what she is, but because of the great things the Lord, whose name is holy, has done for her. She next proclaims the great laws of His kingdom. He scatters the proud. He puts down the mighty from their seats, He exalts them of low degree. He fills the hungry with good things, He sends the rich empty away. He has now helped His servant Israel, remembering His everlasting covenant with Abraham and his seed.

As a lowly daughter of the house of David, Mary had often, and more than ever during her journey from Nazareth to the town of Zacharias, experienced the lot of the poor, the despised, the oppressed, and especially of those rejected ones who bear in their hearts the nobility of a higher vocation, of deeper reflection, and greater devotedness of life. She must, during this journey, have looked upon herself as a princess of such rejected ones. But now, through the greeting of her friend, she attained a higher assurance, that the grace of God had very highly exalted and would glorify her. She now saw the whole world glitter in the sunshine of that grace which raises the rejected; that realm of glory to which God elevates the humble and lowly was now displayed before her eyes. She had a presentiment of the Good Friday and Easter Day of her Son.

Some have insisted that Mary’s song of praise is derived from that of Hannah (1 Sam. i.) But the two songs only need to be compared to arrive at the conviction that Mary’s is thoroughly original; although it shows, by certain free reminiscences, that, as a pious Israelite woman, she was acquainted with the song of Hannah, who had been in a condition somewhat similar. It has further been asserted that songs of praise, such as these, are not directly produced among the events of actual life, but are only the artistic reproduction of that life. But here it may be asked, how much poetic power may be attributed to human life? For Christologists who recognize the ideal height of humanity in the history of Jesus, it is certain that the poetry with which human life is everywhere else penetrated, as the ore is by the precious metal, could not

but appear here in its purest state. There are countries where the vine grows wild, countries where roses are indigenous, countries where song is the natural expression of joyful emotion; and here we have found that elevated region, where the hymn comes forth in its perfect form, in the midst of actual life.¹

Mary remained three months with her friend. That she should have stayed so long, and yet have left without waiting till Elisabeth's delivery, points to a change in her relations with Joseph. As the absent always become more dear, and the dead perfect, so did the image of Mary grow fairer in his mind after her departure. The impression which she had made upon him was one so pure and holy, that the Spirit of God would increasingly justify it to his mind. He must now have considered himself blameable, nay, harsh, and a conflict must have arisen within him. Such a state of mind was the immediate cause of the revelation now vouchsafed unto him.

Even a dream may become the instrument of a divine communication. In circumstances when the daily life of pious men is devoted more to the concerns of the world, the susceptibility of their minds for divine things would be more easily concentrated during the season of night, as the night violet emits its fragrance during the darkness. In this case, dreams become, in critical circumstances, a mirror for the reflection of divine visions. It was also natural that Joseph, the worthy artizan, should receive his revelations in dreams. The directions he received so agitated him, that he awoke, and communicated to him such assurance, such an impulse to set his misconceived bride at rest, that rising from sleep, he immediately sought her out. This seems clearly enough to point to a journey. He arose early in the morning, brought her home 'to her house' (Luke i. 56), and treated her till her delivery with reverential tenderness, as one dedicated to a more exalted destiny. Thus did the Lord, in due time, reward the confidence of Mary, and preserve her honour. This fact was, at the same time, a great victory won by the Gospel over ancient precept in the heart of the carpenter. The miracles of the New Testament times penetrated his lower life, and elevated him to true Israelite feeling. In intercourse with Mary, he also found his blessing, his gospel. The childhood of the great Prince of man and the Redeemer of the world was to be passed under the care and protection of an honest artizan. Thus was mere worth ennobled, and the dignity of handicraft honoured.

¹ They who have witnessed the exaltation of great characters in important circumstances, will comprehend this incident in its essential features. In this passage Christianity and poetry change places before those critics who deny the historical reality of the poetry for the sake of opposing the historical reality of primitive Christianity. Even poetry must reject such critics and their dicta, as proceeding from a region where the beautiful is not true, and the true not beautiful. [The critics seem to miscalculate, even on psychological principles, the effect on them of events like these, which assured them that the long-sought salvation of God was now about to appear, and that its pledges were already before their eyes.—Mill, *Mythical Interp.*, p. 116. All that this forcible and learned writer says upon the subject-matter of these hymns, as well as his whole refutation of the objections to these early chapters of the Gospels, will abundantly repay perusal.—ED.] *

in its inner relation to the true purposes of the kingdom of God. The priest brought up the King's herald, but the artizan protected with his honest hand the great King Himself during the tender years of childhood.

It was at about this time that Elisabeth brought forth her promised son. The wonderful nature of this event, her happiness, which proclaimed the mercy of God, spread great joy among her kinsfolk and neighbours. When the child was eight days old, the festival of his circumcision was kept. The guests were anxious to give him the name of Zacharias ; but his mother Elisabeth earnestly opposed it. Zacharias was appealed to for decision ; by signs he asked for a writing-table, and then wrote the name of John ! *the favour of God, the pledge of God's favour.* With this announcement his soul was freed from the reproach which had oppressed it, his tongue from the mysterious ethic tie or ban by which it had been enchain'd.

The song of praise which Zacharias now uttered had been so gradually and certainly matured in his soul, that, like Mary, he could not forget it again. His song pointed out the form of his faith ; it was the expression of the Gospel as it resounded within his own heart. It was a truly priestly view that Zacharias took of the reconciliation and glorification of the world in the advent of Messiah. The coming Christ appeared to him as the true altar of safety, the refuge of His people. In future, the people of God, delivered from their enemies, would be ever at liberty to perform the true, real service of God, the worship which would glorify Him. This was the delight of his priestly heart. But it was the delight of his paternal heart that his child should be the herald of the Lord, in whom grace was to appear even to those who sat in darkness and the shadow of death. Such is the matter of his song of praise.

And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit. The youthful Nazarite grew up to his calling in the lonely hill country. The time was soon to come when he would be shown to and produce a vast effect upon the whole nation of Israel.

NOTES.

1. When critics insist (comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 165) that the angel must have brought to Joseph in a dream a revelation connected with that formerly communicated to Mary, must have reproached Joseph with his unbelief, and have thought it superfluous to tell him the name of the child, having already done so to Mary, they speak unintentionally for the reality of the said communications. For it is not in the nature of a dream to maintain a practical appearance. If, then, a revelation should take the form of a dream, it must renounce the condition of practicality. It must also renounce conformity to the law of economy, and to that prudence of critics which would rather blend several dream-visions in one (*Id.* p. 261). Criticism would rather have depicted practical dreams. But in so doing it would have destroyed the nature of the dream. Macbeth 'slays holy sleep ;' criticism, the holy dream.

2. Strauss makes an inaccurate quotation when he says, ‘It is quite clear that *εύρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχοντα* (Matt. i. 18) points to a discovery without Mary’s acquiescence.’ The passage runs, *εύρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχοντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου*,—she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Was this found without Mary’s acquiescence? What justified the author in omitting the closer definition of the sentence?

3. Strauss and Bruno Bauer insist upon pressing upon Luke i.¹⁴ 4 the view, that the leaping of the babe in her womb first revealed to Elisabeth that Mary was selected to be the mother of the Messiah. On the other hand, they combat the notion that the emotion of the mother would, by the effect it produced upon her organism, occasion the leaping of the child. According to this assumption, the text would have run: As soon as the unborn child heard the salutation, it leaped. Elisabeth hears the salutation—Mary’s salutation: can any one deny her emotion? The child leaps: can any one deny the connection of its leaping with its mother’s emotion? Elisabeth views this leaping in the poetic element of her own frame of mind, and this sublime, transparent, healthy poetry is transformed into a supernaturalistic formula, according to which the movement of the unborn child is said to reveal to its mother the dignity of Mary. This text is thus made to say, that the mother understood nothing of the spirit of the salutation; that the fruit of her body understood it immediately; and then that the leaping of this fruit of the same mother who found nothing in the salutation of her friend, was a plain revelation to her that this friend should bring forth the Messiah.

SECTION VI.

THE BIRTH OF JESUS AT BETHLEHEM.

(Luke ii.)

When Mary already saw the time of her approaching delivery at hand, she had occasion to travel to Bethlehem with her husband.

The occasion was a civil duty. According to the command of the government, which had ordained a taxation of the inhabitants of Palestine, Joseph was obliged to betake himself to Bethlehem, the town of his family, to be there registered according to his name and property. Mary was also subject to this registration.¹ According to the Gospel (vers. 1 and 2), this taxing was decreed by the Emperor Augustus; it was the first which had taken place in Judea, and happened when Cyrenius was governor in Syria.

¹ That the words *with Mary, &c.*, Luke ii. 5, relate much more naturally to the immediately preceding words, *to be taxed*, than to the preceding expression *he went up*, is evident even from the construction of the sentence. But when the parenthesis is made, and *διὸ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν* referred to Joseph alone, this is easily explained. It needed not to be remarked of Mary that she was descended from David, this being patent to Christian consciousness; while it was necessary to notice the fact that Joseph was so descended.

We here encounter a great and much canvassed difficulty.¹ How, it is first asked, could Augustus decree this taxing in Palestine, when king Herod, though dependent upon Rome, still governed the country? And how comes Cyrenius to be mentioned, who, according to Josephus, did not come to Palestine till about ten years later, and that in order to complete the taxing? It is further asked, Why were Mary and Joseph obliged to travel to Bethlehem, when a Roman enrolment required no such change of locality? And finally, Why was Mary obliged to accompany her husband on this journey?

We must first repeat, that we consider Mary the authority for the history of Jesus' childhood. It is probable that Luke had a narrative by her of the journey to Bethlehem, which he introduced into his own work. In this narrative Mary would express herself according to the political views of an elevated female mind, overlooking the immediate authors of a public measure, and referring it to that supreme power which, though it kept in the background, was actually its author. Herod, the dependent prince, disappeared from the view of the narrator, who, from the point of view afforded by mental observation of the state of the world, was contemplating the source of the great political measures taking place in Palestine. Hence, in grand and womanly style, she named the Emperor Augustus as the originator of the decree of Herod, that a census should take place in Palestine.²

Luke, the compiler of the narrative, would not, in his earnest truthfulness, alter this account. He knew, however, that this taxing formed part of a general undertaking, first completed by Cyrenius some years afterwards. He therefore inserts, by way of correction, the words: The taxing itself took place when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.³ Subsequently the word *αὐτὴν*, whose signification was no longer understood, was read *αὐτην*, i.e., instead of: the

¹ On the whole question of the census, compare the excellent remarks of Ebrard, *Gospel History*, 136. [Or the very useful work of Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, pp. 65–74 (Lond. 1863); or Fairbairn's *Hermeneutical Manual*, p. 461; or Davidson's *Introduction*, pp. 206–214.—ED.]

² If, for instance, a Westphalian woman were to speak of a levy of troops in her country in the year 1810, she would very probably say, ‘The Emperor Napoleon commanded it,’ although, from politic views, it had issued immediately from the dependent king Jerome. Mary likewise comprised the single taxing which Herod decreed with the general kind of taxing which proceeded from the government of Augustus. The expression, all the world, *πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη*, can never be limited to Palestine alone, not to mention the fact that a decree of the Emperor Augustus is here spoken of (comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, p. 228). Hebrew national feeling very clearly expresses the contrast between the Holy Land and the whole earth: an *οἰκουμένη* referring merely to Palestine, cannot then be imagined from this point of view.

³ [Even though this explanation were necessary, the words of Luke do not admit of it; because he gives us to understand that whatever the *ἀπογραφὴ* was,—whether a taxation, or an enrolment preparatory to taxation,—it was effected at the time of this journey of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem. They went up, *ἀπογράφεσθαι* (ii. 3–6), not to accomplish something which might be separated ten years from the *ἀπογραφὴ*, but for itself; and it was this, this *ἀπογραφὴ* accomplished by their visit to Bethlehem, which was at the same time accomplished under Cyrenius. So that whether we read *αὐτὴν* or *αὐτην*, we cannot interpose a number of years between ver. 3, when all went to be taxed, and ver. 2, when the taxing was

taxing itself—this taxing.¹ That king Herod could not but allow the organic movements which took place in the Romish state² to prevail in his realm, was but natural.³ It was quite in accordance with the character of the times that a registration should take place. But when a king instituted such a taxing, the Jewish national feeling would oblige him to carry it out according to Hebrew genealogical order.⁴ Is it still asked, Why Mary accompanied Joseph? We do not know for certain whether she was obliged to be personally present at the enrolment; it is probable that, as a virgin, she desired to represent the house of her father.⁵ At all

made. But, as is now very well known, there is no necessity for interposing any interval between the decree and its fulfilment, between the birth of Jesus and the government of Cyrenius. The investigations of Zumpt have made it appear almost certain that Cyrenius was twice governor of Syria, viz., from 750–753, as well as from 760–765. This is exhibited in his *Essay De Syria Romanorum provincia*, in vol. ii. of his *Comment. Epigraph. ad Antiq. Rom. pertinent.*, Berlin, 1854. A summary of his results may be seen in Alford, Lichtenstein, or Andrews.—ED.]

¹ We believe that the above statement corroborates the hypothesis of Paulus, which has hitherto merely stood upon its own merits, even without giving the origin of the change of *αὐτὴν* into *αὐτην*. The view that the second verse is a gloss, is a gratuitous assertion, and one which is so much the worse, as not answering its purpose, since the decree of Caesar Augustus still remains in the first verse. This applies also to the assertion that *πρώτη* stands for *προτέρα* (see Tholuck, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit, &c.*, p. 182). At all events, it does not explain the first verse at all, and the second only in a very forced manner. The hypothesis that Cyrenius came once into Palestine ten years before he was governor of Syria, endowed with extraordinary powers for the execution of this taxing, and that *ἡγεμονεύοντος* refers to these extraordinary powers, and not to his government of the province, is the most improbable of all. For the word must, at all events, relate to Syria, and may consequently designate only the *Præses Syrie* (see Strauss, i. 233). In any case, an exegete should decide whether he will make decided use of any one expedient; and to connect different expedients through an apologetic economy, is certainly not allowable.

² According to Suetonius and Dio Cass., Augustus carried on registration during his whole life (comp. Rieger, *das Leben Jesu*, 313); and according to Tacitus (*Anal.* i. 11), left behind him the result of these labours in a state paper. Compare what Tholuck adduces in *Die Glaubwürdigkeit, &c.*, from Savigny on the general census in the time of Augustus, and Neander's quotation from Cassiodorus, p. 22.

³ The taxing of Cyrenius (*ἀπογραφὴ*) of which Josephus speaks, *Antiq.* 18, 1, is more accurately defined as an *ἀποτίμησις*, and may consequently assume that foundation of every taxation, the registration of names. *Αὐτὴν* also seems to point to this contrast. According to Tacitus, *Anal.* i. ii., Augustus had procured registers of the forces of kings in alliance with Rome. This is a striking proof that he was the originator of the registrations taken by the allied kings, and consequently by Herod, though they might not be carried on according to Roman forms. The census of Cyrenius does not accord with the description of such registrations. Hence the remark of Strauss (p. 230) against the signification of the passage adduced from Tacitus is of no force.

⁴ Comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* 18, 1; Acts v. 37. On the Jewish form of enrolment, comp. Ebrard, p. 137, where he cursorily mentions the contradiction into which Strauss has here betrayed himself.

⁵ It has been supposed (Olshausen, *Commentary*, i. 119) that Mary, as an heiress of property in Bethlehem, was obliged to undertake this journey. If she were an heiress, she would have been obliged, according to Num. xxxvi., to marry into her own family. But it does not follow that her husband (comp. Nehem. vii. 63) must have been received into her family, and have taken her name, and still less that the wife must necessarily be enrolled. In the consideration of this passage, it has been overlooked that, as yet, Mary was only betrothed, and consequently personally represented her own line, perhaps that of Heli, especially if she were an orphan. Thus the daughters of Zelophehad had, undoubtedly, represented their father at the numbering of the people (Num. xxxvi. 2). In this case, Mary would certainly be entered as a virgin daughter of her house.

events, the expression of the Evangelist seems to point out that she was subjected to the same ceremony as her husband. Thus much, however, is quite certain, that there was no law which obliged her to remain at home. She was now more than ever in need of the care of Joseph. But not this circumstance alone would impel her to decide on accompanying him. Her heart yearned towards Bethlehem. This town had of late become the object of her earthly desires. We cannot be surprised if the theocratic life in her bosom should have made the beloved city of her fathers the object of sacred desire to her maternal feelings. A wish henceforth to dwell there might already have been matured in her mind, since, after her return from Egypt she and Joseph were at first resolved upon so doing. The poetic glory of the city of David could have beamed more brightly in no Jewish heart than in hers, especially at this time, when the hope of David's house was reflected in the happy anticipations and yearning of her mind. If the life of the child were reflected in the life of the mother, wondrous poetic, child-like, and elevated desires would arise within her. Bethlehem was Mary's desire.¹ The travellers had not been long in Bethlehem when the hour of Mary's delivery arrived, and she brought forth her *first-born son*.² According to an ancient tradition, reported by Justin Martyr, the place of the nativity was a cave, still shown in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem.³ It is very possible that this building leant against the side of a hill. Others suppose that it was in the manger of the caravanserai of Bethlehem that the child was born.⁴ A caravanserai, however, would be a place entirely inappropriate for such an event as a birth. The usual representations would have us seek the new-born Saviour in a stable. The Evangelist distinguishes the manger (or the stall, *φάτνη*) as a separate place from the inn (*κατάλυμα*). In Palestine, as in all patriarchal districts, there are huts in which the boundaries between the stable and the room, the dwelling of man and the dwelling of the cattle, are not very clearly defined. In such a hut this noble pair seem to have found a shelter.

The contrast between the eternal majesty and lowly appearance of Christ has ever struck mankind, edified Christendom, and exercised a sanctifying influence upon the world. The Prince of

¹ The assumption that a pregnant woman would not travel with her husband to a distant place, unless she also had been summoned, and that her journey is uncertain in the same degree as the summons is uncertain, is too naive to need discussion. If the critics who attack this text could by any means prove that a woman was forbidden to undertake such a journey, they might argue against the internal truth of the narrative with better success.

² Luke ii. 7.

³ [Justin's words are: 'Since Joseph had not where to lodge in that town, he rested in a certain cave (*σπηλαῖον τύποι*) close by it. And so it was,' &c. Maundrell complains (*Early Travels*, p. 478) that almost everything of interest is, in the Holy Land, represented as having been done in grottoes, even where the circumstances of the action require places of another nature. Matt. ii. 11 is not decisive on the point, because by that time room may have been found in the house, or because the house may have included a cavern behind, as described by Thomson (*Land and Book*, 645). —ED.]

⁴ Comp. Ammon, *Leben Jesu*, p. 202, and others.

heaven, though rich, became poor, to make our poor world rich. That the Son of God should have appeared in such poverty, glorifies, on one hand, His divinity, on the other, human poverty. Divine love appears in its most surprising aspect in this submission to humanity. Humanity, even in a state of poverty, thus becomes sacred. The child in the manger is not exposed to poverty of mind because he is so poor in outward circumstances. His mother calls his name *Jesus, God's salvation for the world*. This glorification of poverty is at the same time a glorification of human nature itself. How far has the modern view of the world sunk in the tendency of many minds below this Christian view of life! When poverty is cursed, the honour of free human personality is unconsciously cursed. Christ is a child of the poor traveller, born upon a journey, and, according to common ideas, in extreme want. He was first cradled in a manger. Yet Christ saved and infinitely enriched the world.

But it is not only the contrast of the ideal elevation of Christ with the lowliness of this scene of His birth which is thus striking, but also the relations in which the historical elevation of the holy family stands to its first entrance into the history of the world.

The carpenter Joseph, under whose care and civil fatherhood Jesus was placed, according to the counsel of God, was descended from the house of David. The Evangelist Matthew has given us his genealogy in a solemn and significant compilation, in a symmetrical arrangement of circumstances, significantly expressing the tragic course of David's line. After the first fourteen generations, the line attains to kingly dignity. In the next fourteen, it fills the high position of the royal house. In the last fourteen, we see its fall from secular royal dignity; and Mary's husband, the carpenter, as foster-father of the poor yet royal child, stands at the close of this series.¹

Mary also was of the tribe of Judah. Many have indeed believed

¹ The first series numbers fourteen members, including David; the second fourteen, including Jeconias; the third only thirteen, including Christ. It is impossible to suppose an error of computation in so definite a calculation. If, then, one is really found, it must be considered as intentional, and as pointing to some omitted member. Some have sought to render it complete by assuming that the Jeconias before the captivity was replaced by another Jeconias from among his brethren,—*i.e.*, a relation who, according to the Levirate law of marriage, raised up seed to his brother after the captivity. (Compare Rieger, *Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 444.) But it would be contrary to the law of Levirate in such cases to count the same name twice. Even Rieger does not resort to this expedient, but supposes the omission of one member. Since Mary is in this genealogy mentioned after Joseph as the mother of Jesus, it is probable that its compiler, by his evident omission of the fourteenth member, was desirous of leading to a view of the unique significance of Mary in this genealogy. Compare my essay *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter, &c.*, p. 54: Ebrard, p. 151. Strauss's remark, that if Mary is counted, Thamar must be counted also, and Joseph left out, ignores the fact that Thamar's place is supplied by her husband, and that Joseph forming an independent member in his genealogy cannot be omitted. But neither can the calculation proceed immediately from him to Christ, unless an error is to be established. On the omission of single generations, comp. Ebrard, p. 152. It cannot be thought surprising if, in a genealogy founded on symmetrical principles, single generations are passed over.

her to have been of the tribe of Levi, because she is described (Luke i. 36) as a relation of Elisabeth, who was of the race of Aaron. Israelites were, however, allowed to marry into other than their paternal tribes (Num. xxxvi. 2). The mother, therefore, of Elisabeth might have descended from the family of Mary,¹ or the relationship might have existed in some other manner. The Apostle Paul decidedly says of Christ, that He was of the house of David (Rom. i. 3). In the angelic annunciation, it is said of Christ, The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David (Luke i. 32)—a promise which, being addressed to Mary, by whom He was to be brought forth, must here be understood in a genealogical sense. And her union with Joseph is in accordance with this. Joseph was of the race of David; a circumstance leading to the conclusion that Mary was also descended from that king. For the marriage between Joseph and Mary exhibits very plainly the patriarchal characteristic of being caused by family relations. It would be far more difficult to comprehend, if regarded as a purely ideal and free one between children of different tribes. Hence it has from the very first been natural, to regard the genealogy given by Luke as that of Mary.

The sole difficulty presented by this view, is the fact that the names of Zerubbabel and Salathiel appear in both lines. This may, however, be explained by a temporary coincidence of the two genealogies, resulting from the ordinance of the Levirate law of marriage.² On the other hand, this view is peculiarly adapted to remove many more important difficulties. It offers the most simple explanation of the differences between the two genealogical tables, the turn of expression by which Luke designates Joseph as the merely ostensible father of Christ, and the carrying back of the line of Jesus to Adam. Luke, according to the character of his Gospel, was desirous of giving the genealogy of the Son of man. We cannot then but suppose that he obtained the genealogy of the mother of Jesus. He so far sacrifices to custom as to mention Joseph; but the very manner in which this is done, points out his true relation to Jesus and Heli, the living means of connection between these latter being Mary.

If Luke were, in his characteristic vein, announcing the nobility of mankind, when deriving the descent of Jesus from Adam, and the divinity of the origin of mankind, by referring the life of Adam to God, everything would, in such a genealogy, depend upon the reality of the natural succession. Only the historical descent of the mother of Jesus could be of any importance in such a view of the genealogy of Jesus. In accordance with this supposition, even Jewish tradition has designated Heli as the father of Mary.³

It was a sad and tragic circumstance, that the daughter of David,

¹ Neander thinks (*Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 20, note) that Elisabeth may well have sprung from the tribe of Judah. The passage Luke i. 5, however, speaks too decidedly to the contrary.

² Comp. Riegler, i. 444; Ebrard, p. 159.

³ Comp. W. Hoffmann, *das Leben Jesu*, &c., p. 165.

the mother of the King in whom that great promise concerning Bethlehem was to be fulfilled, ‘Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting,’ should return in so poor and unknown a condition to the cradle of her race. The country was already dependent upon the world-wide power of Rome; the will of its emperor obliged this royal Jewish family to travel under the most trying circumstances, and brought them to the poor inn of Bethlehem, which suffered them to appear in a mendicant-like condition. The child whom Jewish anticipation had adorned with all the splendour of supreme worldly power was born in a stable-like hut, and cradled in a manger, while the despotic Edomite sat upon the throne of His fathers, and governed Israel.

But the new-born babe was no pretender; the old world was not His inheritance, but a new and lovelier world, which He brought with Him, in His heart. The tragic shadows falling in a worldly point of view upon the holy family, do but give greater brilliancy to that divine relationship and spiritual glory in which it announced and brought in a new future raised above the curse. The beginnings of this new world play, like celestial lights, with marvellous splendour around the hard cradle of the Holy Child, and glorify His appearing.

NOTE.

As far as the relation of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke to the doctrine of Christ’s descent from David is concerned, it must first be firmly laid down, that this doctrine is entirely independent of their construction. In a genuine and powerful family tradition, the tradition is not supported by the genealogy, but the genealogy by the tradition. Such genealogies may, under special juridical occurrences, become decisive documents, but the tradition satisfies the unprejudiced disposition of the world. If the family of Mary had made legitimist pretensions to the crumbling throne of Herod, our ‘criticism’ would perhaps be justified in taking upon itself the task of a herald’s college and testing the genealogies, and on the discovery of traces of a suspicious kind, in pronouncing them invalid or doubtful. But it must then have a thorough knowledge of the science of heraldry, and a feeling for those embellishments and methods of treatment by which genealogical trees are often somewhat interrupted in their natural growth. Matthew seems to have been such a genealogist, in the highest historical style. The shadow of the curse and the light of the blessing play upon the whole of his genealogy. Luke, on the contrary, is a genealogist of the ideal style. With holy feeling does his genealogy trace the descent of Christ past David and Abraham to Adam. That Christ is the Son of man, the Son of God, and the Son of David, is the fundamental principle upon which both genealogies were written.

That it is absurd to admit the idea of mythic genealogies in a Jewish family, is evident from an estimation of the fundamental relations of Israel. The difference between the genealogies in ques-

tion, has indeed been explained in another manner than by the fact that Luke communicates Mary's, and Matthew, Joseph's descent. The hypothesis of Julius Africanus, according to which, both exhibit the descent of Joseph, which receives its twofold character through the parallel descent of two lines, in two Levirate marriages, has obtained much credit.¹ Apart, however, from the other difficulties which this view presents, it may be remarked, that it would militate against the great precision always observed by the Jews in their treatment of genealogical relations, to suffer an illegitimate descent to figure in the presence of the legitimate one.

On the composition and mutual relation of the genealogical tables, compare in W. Hoffman's *das Leben Jesu*, &c., the instructive section, the Genealogy of Jesus, p. 148, which gives an ingenious explanation of the circumstance that duplicate names appear in Luke's genealogy, a phenomenon which Bruno Bauer has attempted to represent as bearing the impress of non-authenticity. The author ascribes Luke's genealogy to Mary. 'A genealogy of Joseph, adduced as a proof of the true human personality of Jesus, with the remark that he was not the true father of Jesus, and after the narrative of the supernatural conception, would have been utterly purposeless both to Jews and Gentiles; and either an extremely perplexing or an insincere act would be ascribed to the author by insisting that among the Jews it was only customary to give the genealogy of the husband. It was not that this was customary, but it was so, when giving that of the woman, to insert in her place in the table the name of her husband, whether he were the actual father of her son or not.'

SECTION VII.

THE FIRST HOMAGE, OR THE SHEPHERDS AND THE WISE MEN.

When the first man entered the world, Nature surrounded his childhood in all the glory and bloom of her paradisaic constitution. The appearance of the natural man was solemnized in a natural paradise.² The spiritual man was also surrounded by a paradise when He entered the world—by a paradise homogeneous to His nature, a paradise of New Testament dispositions. Of these dispositions He was Himself the principle. As the flower must be surrounded by its garland of leaves, and Adam by his paradise, so

¹ [Besides being adopted by Winer and Meyer, the view that both genealogies belong to Joseph is held by most English scholars; e.g., by Alford, Ellicott, Westcott, Fairbairn, and Mill. The ancient opinions are given by Fairbairn (*Herm. Man.* p. 181), and perhaps the ablest discussion of the whole matter is that of Mill (*Myth. Interp.* p. 147, &c.). Lord Arthur Hervey holds the same opinion, and has reproduced his work on the genealogies (Camb. 1853) in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*. The opposite opinion is, however, maintained not only by the author, but by Wieseler, Rüggenbach, Greswell, Ebrard, and others.—Ed.]

² That we herewith deny the rude constructions of the origin of the first man which have arisen within the sphere of natural philosophy, and that, even in the philosophical interest of natural freedom, needs only a passing remark.

was the birth of Christ, the bodily manifestation of the Gospel, surrounded by a circle of inspired dispositions and revelations, of reflexes of the Gospel. The centre in which the union of divinity with humanity took place, spread around it a great vibration throughout the mental world ; the birth of the Messiah was that heavenly note which called forth wondrous responsive echoes from every Messianically disposed heart. The Child in the manger was therefore glorified by a circle of Messianic revelations.¹

Even on the holy night of Christ's birth, the shepherds of Bethlehem appeared in the abode of the holy family. They greeted the Holy Child, and then related the marvellous occurrence by which His importance had been made known to them. As they were keeping watch by night over their flocks in the fields, the angel of the Lord had appeared to them, and the glory of the Lord had shone round about them. The words point to a vision of the angel of the covenant ; the incarnation of God had itself shed its light upon their souls. The Gospel which the angel of the Lord proclaimed to them, was just the Gospel for these shepherds. He announced to them great joy to all nations : Christ born in Bethlehem ; their shepherd-town honoured as the city of David ; the Saviour in the manger. Thereupon they heard the praises of the heavenly host. Their hearts were so exalted, their state of mind so raised above the world, that they were capable of hearing the hymns of heaven at the birth of Christ. This one occurrence, however, involves a threefold effect : glory to God is manifested in the highest ; earth obtains the peace of heaven ; among men the goodwill in which God receives and blesses mankind, has personally appeared.²

It may be said that the ancient festal song of the Christian Church *Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr*, was derived from this revelation from heaven. As truly, too, may it be affirmed that it originated in the night-watches of the poor shepherds ; it is the shepherd-lay of the Christian world.

Mary kept all these things in her deep, faithful heart, and pondered on them in holy meditation.

After this strange homage, however, one still more striking was offered to the new-born child, by the appearance of the Magi from the East. They probably arrived shortly after Christ's birth, during one of the following nights. This may be inferred from the circumstance, that they entered, as the Evangelist at least seems to say, during the night-season, when the stars were visible in the heavens. Such an arrival at so unwonted an hour, points to a household whose usual domestic arrangements are still suspended by the novelty of a birth. The whole context, too, of the history leads to

¹ It may here be, once for all, remarked that our view is, that in the realm of primitive Christianity there is for every christological human disposition a predisposing revelation, for every revelation a corresponding human disposition. The God-man could not but be surrounded by a periphery of the God-manlike.

² We leave to exegesis the discussion of the various views on this subject. Our interpretation is founded on Eph. i. 5, 6, and other passages.

this conclusion. With their appearance is connected the flight of Mary and Joseph into Egypt. But this cannot well be misplaced after the presentation of Jesus in the temple, if we consider the remark of the Evangelist (Luke ii. 39), that the parents of Jesus returned to Nazareth after this presentation, as a genuine one.¹ They fell down before the Child, who was the object of their unexampled and peculiar veneration, and offered Him gifts emblematic of their homage, gold, frankincense, and myrrh.

The guidance which led the Magi to the birthplace of Christ, was a miracle of divine providence. It shows how that love of truth by which noble and candid minds are impelled, contributes, under God's providence, to lead them with happy certainty to the true aim of their life, even if error should accidentally intermingle uncertain or even false assumptions; nay, how the preponderance of the spirit of truth converts even error into a means of promoting their progress towards the goal of knowledge.

The Magi, according to the original meaning of the word, were either Median, or especially Persian scholars. In those times, the Persian view of the world had spread abroad through Syria and Arabia, and 'Magi was the general name given to travelling astrologers, conjurers, and soothsayers.'² Wise men of those days were sometimes accustomed to make long journeys to seek the treasures of wisdom in distant lands. Hence it would not be surprising if these Magi came from the most remote parts. They may, however, probably have dwelt not very far from Palestine, especially if they came directly eastward from Arabia to Bethlehem.³

But how came these heathen philosophers to expect the Messiah? In answering this question, too much reliance has been placed upon an uncertain historical notice, while a great, certain, actual relation has been ignored. Suetonius, in his *Life of Vespasian* (c. iv.), relates that an ancient and definite expectation had spread throughout the East, that a ruler of the world would, at about that time, arise in Judea. Tacitus also similarly expresses himself (*Hist.* v. 13). It is, however, probable⁴ that both derived this notion from a passage in Josephus (*De Bello Jud.* vi. 5, 4). Josephus relates of the Jews besieged in Jerusalem, that what most induced them to rebel, was an ambiguous oracle in their sacred writings, declaring that at that time one going forth from their country would govern the world. This, says Josephus, they referred to a native, though it manifestly points to Vespasian, who was summoned from Judea to become emperor. Thus Josephus had merely the Messianic hopes of the besieged Jews in view, though it was not without

¹ Even chronology leads to this view. Comp. Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 49 ff., especially p. 65.

² So Winer on this article in his *R.W.B.*

³ [On the various traditions regarding the wise men of the East, see Kitto, *Life of our Lord*, p. 113, &c. On the astrology of the Magi, see Mill, *Myth. Interp.*, p. 299, &c.—ED.]

⁴ Comp. Gieseler's *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i. p. 47; [and Ellicott's note on this point (*Hist. Lect.* 44), who thinks the imitation is not clearly made out.—ED.]

perfidy that he referred the Old Testament foundation of this hope to Vespasian.

It is, however, a world-wide fact, that the fame of the temple had spread through all the East;¹ that the Jews, at the time of Christ, had already spread throughout the world;² and that their religion had gained proselytes among the noblest and most susceptible spirits of the day. Nothing is more easy to account for, than that there should be noble-minded inquirers in Arabia, Syria, or Persia, in whom a receptive disposition had been kindled by the Messianic hopes of Israel, as by a spark from God, and had awakened great, though dim hopes and desires. To such a class of minds belonged also those Greeks who, according to John's Gospel (xii. 20), desired to become acquainted with the Messiah.

The Magi believed that they had received, in their native land, a sign that the King of the Jews, who had obtained in their view a religious significance, was born. They had seen His star. If we suppose that they looked upon a star as the sign of the Messiah in an astrological sense, we must think of a constellation as directing them. The astrologer, as such, deals with a constellation, while in a constellation the chief matter is the relation in which one star stands to the others.³ If this fundamental principle of astrology had not been lost sight of, such various notions would not have been entertained concerning the phenomenon of the Magi; nor could it have been considered at one time a meteor, at another a comet, at another the exclusive appearance of a new star.⁴ Nor could it have been remarked that if a constellation of stars were here meant, a star could not have been spoken of. The astrologer has to do with a star which belongs to his hero; the meaning, however, of this star is made known to him by the position it occupies in the constellation.

The renowned astronomer Kepler has shown,⁵ that in the year 747 after the building of Rome, a very remarkable triple conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn took place; that in the spring of the following year, the planet Mars also was added to them; and has declared it very probable, that an extraordinary star may have been added to these three superior planets, as happened in the year 1603. Kepler considers this remarkable conjunction to have been the star

¹ [Tacitus says, in describing Jerusalem (*Hist.* v. 8), 'Illic immensæ opulentiae templum,' &c.; also in c. 5 he endeavours to account for what he speaks of as a well-known fact—'auctæ Judæorum res.'—ED.]

² [Schlegel mentions, in his *Philosophy of History*, that the Buddhist missionaries travelling to China, met Chinese sages going to seek the Messiah about the year 33 A.D.—ED.]

³ Hence perhaps the expression, *ἐν τῷ ἀνατολῇ*, Matt. ii. 2, is to be understood of the astrological definition of the star's rising. [Alford's reasons for rendering these words 'in the east,' are perhaps scarcely sufficient, though the reasons on the other side are possibly no more decisive. Neither do Lichtenstein's references (p. 91) to Rev. vii. 2, xvi. 12, disprove the author's rendering, for in both those passages the defining *ἡλιόν* is added. The note of Alford may, however, here be referred to as an admirable summary of what is to be held regarding this star.—ED.]

⁴ As, e.g., the author in his work, *Ueber die geschichtliche Charakter der canon. Evangelien.*

⁵ Comp. Wieseler as above.

of the wise men. Ideler the chronologist further improved upon his view. Wieseler refers to it with the remark, that, according to a notice of Münter, it is reported in the Chinese astronomical tables, that a new star appeared at a time corresponding with the fourth year before the birth of Christ.

All chronological notices referring to the birth of Christ lead, according to Wieseler's calculations, to the conclusion that Jesus was born in the year 750 after the building of Rome (four years before the birth of Christ according to the ordinary computation), and most probably in the month of February. This conjunction, however, took place in the year 747 and 748, and therefore two years earlier.

Hence the Magi undoubtedly looked upon one star of this conjunction as the star of the Messiah. If they consequently judged as astrologers, it does not follow that the result could not have corresponded with their view. It would be a terrible tenet concerning divine providence, to assert that it could not suffer a sincere love of truth to gain its end, if it should accidentally proceed on false or uncertain premisses. Astronomy, *e.g.*, certainly arose from astrology, chemistry from alchemy; and the Son of man Himself came after the flesh, of the race of Adam. This star then actually became, by God's appointment, the star of the Messiah to the Magi, though the birth of the Messiah did not exactly coincide with this conjunction, and thus proved itself to be raised above this constellation. It was to the Magi a sign;¹ to the Church of Christ, however, it is a symbol that all true astronomy, all sincere inquiry, all the efforts of an earnest love of truth, conduce, under the guidance of God, to the highest knowledge, the knowledge of God in Christ.²

The Magi, indeed, as pilgrims seeking the new-born Messiah, fell immediately into a false supposition. They sought Him in Jerusalem, probably at the court of Herod himself. Their inquiries electrified the Idumean, and his excitement soon spread through the veins of all the royal dependants in the capital.

The tyrant quickly recovered himself, and formed his diabolical plan. He first assembled an ecclesiastical council,³ and put to them the question where Christ should be born. They referred him to the prophecy of Micah (v. 2),⁴ and named Bethlehem. He then

¹ [Augustin calls it the 'magnifica lingua cœli.'—Ep.]

² A modern astrologer would perhaps proceed on the assumption that Jupiter might be designated the star of the eternal God, Jehovah, inasmuch as Zeus might be regarded as the Grecian mutilation of the Jewish knowledge of Jehovah; a triple conjunction, therefore, of Jupiter, with the addition of Mars, would denote a three-fold victory of the eternal God over the time or process God, and that in the sign of the fish, *i.e.*, of the Church.

³ Among the chief priests of this council were included those who presided over the several orders of priests.

⁴ The expression concerning the eternal 'goings forth' of the Bethlehemish ruler, is one of the most profound christological sayings of the Old Testament. The contrast lies in the facts, that the Ruler of Israel proceeds, on the one hand, from the extremely unimportant town of Bethlehem, on the other, from eternity. The Evangelist, in his vivid conception of the sense, has freely rendered the words, 'though thou be little,' by 'thou art not the least.'

privately called for the Magi. He told them the birthplace of Christ, and requested them to inform him of the discovery of the Holy Child. With crafty prudence, however, he at the same time obtained accurate information concerning the time of the first appearance of the star.¹ He perhaps anticipated that he could not make sure of these pious philosophers, who must have appeared to him either as rebuking spirits or as suspicious enthusiasts. The pilgrims went their way. But the circumstance that they suffered themselves to be sent forth from Jerusalem towards Bethlehem, testified to the supernatural assurance with which they had undertaken this journey. Their audience with the king seems to have deprived them of the greater part of the day. His manner and his directions very probably discouraged them. How should they find the King of the Jews in this small shepherd-town? Night closed in upon their wanderings in a strange land; but it brought them consolation, for the star was again seen in the heights of heaven.

If it seemed to them as though the star had travelled with them until it reached Christ's birthplace with them, and that it rested there, this enables us to understand the power and certainty of this conviction.

The critic, however, steps forward, and assures us that the stars pursue their own appointed courses. He gives us, by the way, a piece of astronomical information, which might make the high and mysterious understanding between the eyes of the stars and the stars of the eyes somewhat doubtful. But poets, and wise men of the East, and Christians often wander with the stars, and the stars with them. Must such happy beings be forbidden to speak in the language of the happy, that is, poetically? When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy. But how did they so quickly find the abode of the child? asks the critic. Nay, but was not their condition peculiar? How does the magnetic needle find the pole? The magnetic needle is not made of wood.

Probably the repulsive impression which must have been made by the gloomy Herod upon chosen souls like these, still continued to affect them, and became the more vivid the more it was contrasted with the bright image produced in their minds by the mother of Jesus. The remembrance of Herod's expressions, his injunction that they should bring him word where the young Child was, might awaken and increase within them a feeling of deep mistrust against him. Was it likely that they would conceal from Joseph the solicitude they felt?

Thus their own frame of mind predisposed them to receive a divine revelation in a dream. A vision of the night gave them the direction they needed, and they returned to their homes by another route than Jerusalem.

¹ The critic has no notion of this craftiness, when he supposes that this notice betrays the fact that the Evangelist invented this circumstance with reference to the subsequent slaughter of the children of Bethlehem. Still less does he perceive, that it would be a moral absurdity for so subtle a craftiness to make its next appearance in the aimless slaughter of the children.

Joseph saw the deep seriousness with which they departed in an opposite direction. The excitement of his mind became the element in which the spark of divine revelation was kindled. The command of God was announced to him, that he must save the life of the miraculous Child committed to his keeping, by a flight into Egypt.

NOTE.

It is only a proof of the extraordinary confusion with which the myth-hypothesis has snatched at similarities in the Old Testament to incidents in the New, that the star of the Magi has been connected with the star of Balaam (Num. xxiv. 17), and even derived therefrom. That star figuratively denotes the great King who should come forth from Israel, this is the heavenly sign of His birth. Critics are thus obliged to pass over the great difference between a metaphorical and a literal meaning, to catch at an appearance of the mythic. Comp. Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, Pt. 2, p. 57. Though later Jews cherished the expectation that the Messiah would be announced by a star, it does not follow that this was induced (as Strauss supposes, i. 272) by the prophecy of Balaam. The critic in question, however, makes this assumption, because he must otherwise have maintained that the supposed myth had been merely formed to favour rabbinical and popular Jewish expectations. These expectations must therefore be connected with the star of Balaam, *which however has, even with Rabbis, another meaning*, so that two appearances co-operating may form one greater appearance, from which the mythic appearance aimed at might be deduced. Instead of that constellation of stars which the Magi looked for, criticism is on the look-out for a constellation of appearances, for the purpose of gaining its end.¹

SECTION VIII.

THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT.

(Matt. ii.)

During those critical moments in which the life of the world's new-born Redeemer was endangered, the providence of God, in the

¹ [For an account of the use which has been made of this star as a datum for ascertaining the time of our Lord's birth, the reader must be referred to the very interesting discussions of the leading chronologists. Those who hold that it was merely a meteoric appearance, and subject to none of the ordinary laws of heavenly bodies ('not to astronomical but to special laws,' Ellicott), can of course make no use of it as a chronological datum. But very many of the ablest investigators (Ideler, Patritius, Ebrard, Alford) consider the 'star' to have been the conjunction of planets (Saturn and Jupiter) which occurred, according to Kepler and Ideler, three times in the year 747; and they have on this account been induced to place the birth of our Lord in the same year. Others, of equal name, are inclined to give greater weight to the other data—the government of Cyrenius and the time of our Lord's baptism (which dates are independently ascertained), and to fix the year of the birth as 750 or 749. As Herod died about the 1st of April 750, the birth of Jesus cannot be placed later than this, or indeed later than February of the same year. This is the month chosen by Wieseler, and adopted by the author. Lichtenstein and others prefer the middle or end of 749.—ED.]

centre of operations, co-operated by extraordinary dealings with the highly wrought emotions of the faithful human hearts who surrounded the Holy Child with their reverence and care.

The art of the calculating despot had been defeated by the subtlety of presentiment with which God had enlightened noble minds.¹ The mind of Joseph was meditating on the impressions of the day during the silence of the night. The angel of the Lord alarmed him by an anxious dream. He showed him the danger impending over the child, and commanded him to flee with Him and His mother to Egypt. At the birth of Jesus, the shepherds were already in the fields with their flocks. Hence spring must have begun. At all events, the rainy season of November and December, and the winterly January, must have been over.² Since, however, the death of Herod probably took place in the early part of April, in the year 750 A.U.C., and the slaughter of the innocents preceded his death, the presentation of Jesus in the temple could scarcely have happened before the flight into Egypt.³ Unless we make the period

¹ 'That such an arrangement of matters (*i.e.*, as Matthew relates) would with difficulty be comprehended by the crafty Herod, has long ago been remarked,' &c.—Strauss, i. 254. It has also been long ago remarked, that the Gospel history cannot be held responsible for the folly with which craft is usually conquered in its anti-christian attacks. Moreover, Herod would have been in the highest degree inconsistent with his known character, if he had detained the Magi at Jerusalem, and had meanwhile sought out and put the child to death, or had taken such other means of getting rid of Him as the critic considers advisable. He who had in every possible manner flattered the religious feelings of the nation, would thus have let his hatred to the Messiah be rumoured in Judea. The history knows his character better than such criticism does. His chief concern was to conceal his enmity against the realization of the Messianic hopes of the Jews, and it was this motive which guided his actions.

² Compare Wieseler, p. 148. [This, however, seems to be considered by travellers in Palestine to be an uncertain ground for supposing that the birth of our Lord did not happen in December. They tell us that during December 'the earth is fully clothed with verdure.' And even though it be not customary for flocks to be in the fields at night during that month, the unusual concourse of strangers at this time in Bethlehem might induce the shepherds to betake themselves to the fields and make room in the town.—ED.]

³ Wieseler, p. 155, supposes that the appointment, that a woman should remain at home forty days after her delivery, opposes the view that the ceremony of Mary's purification did not take place till the return from Egypt. This appointment, however, could scarcely forbid or hinder a flight from mortal peril. The same remark applies to the duty of a Jewish female, to make herself ceremonially clean by presenting a thank-offering in the appointed manner, after the accomplishment of her purification, or after forty days. This appointment could naturally only forbid the purification taking place *before* the forty days were accomplished, and it is in this sense that Luke ii. 21 is to be understood. In how many cases might a woman be prevented from observing the day when her purification was accomplished! Nor did the idea of the law of purification involve the necessity of considering a delay beyond the appointed time an illegality. Wieseler himself remarks of the flight into Egypt (p. 157): 'From Bethlehem, which was situate in the south of Palestine, the Egyptian border at Rhinokolura might easily be reached in three or four days, and the parents of Jesus would, in their flight, have travelled as speedily as possible.' Since, then, Joseph, in returning from Egypt, must have made a very long circuit if he had not travelled through Judea, the realm of Archelaus, we cannot but suppose that he was already in this region when he heard of Archelaus, and feared to go thither. I cannot, however, understand, as Hug does, the striking words, ἐφοβήθη ἐκεὶ ἀπελθεῖν, to mean, *he went thither with a fearful heart*, but, he feared to betake himself thither, or to settle there. The expression ἀνεχώρησεν, &c., also accords with this, after the

of at least forty days, which must have intervened between the birth of Jesus and His presentation in the temple, extend so far over the March of that year as to reach April, and occupy a part of February, so that the shepherds were sent into the fields directly after the wintry season, we must suppose that the presentation took place after the return of the holy family from Egypt. We should, at all events, need a longer interval than forty days, if we transpose the presentation in the temple, the return to Bethlehem, the heavenly warning, which did not take place till then, and the subsequent slaughter of the children of Bethlehem, to a time prior to the beginning of April. All the statements of the Evangelists are most easily connected by the view, that the flight into Egypt took place soon, perhaps within a few weeks, after the birth of Jesus.¹

Herod had by this time become certain that the Magi would not return to him. This must have much exasperated a man of his disposition, and have driven him to extremities in his fear of the Messianic Child. He probably, however, formed his designs in secret, as it was in secret also that he had dealt with the Magi. He was too politic a man openly to express his criminal hatred of the promised Son of David.

Terrible things then took place in Bethlehem and its neighbourhood. Our notions of the occurrence take the following form. It was spring, and the parents were, for the most part, occupied in the fields. Soon, however, first one, then another, missed one of their children. One disappeared; another was found suffocated, poisoned, or stabbed, and bathed in its blood. In these mysterious and dreadful events, however, one strange feature of resemblance uniformly prevailed; viz., that only boys were slain; and, moreover, only boys of the tenderest age, none over two years old. The number of these unfortunates could not be great; but the suffering and fear were terribly increased by the mystery and inevitable nature of the danger.

Whence these terrible assassinations arose, no political writer, and no Jew except the hired murderers, could know. But Christian feeling, which had been warned against the attempts of the tyrant, and knew the meaning of the circumstance, that the slain children were two years old and under, could say with certainty: Herod is the originator of this deed. As Peter by the spirit of prophecy announced the secret of Ananias, so probably did Mary that of Herod, from which this slaughter proceeded.² Then arose

analogy of Matt. iv. 12, xii. 15, xiv. 13. It denotes a fugitive, timid, or hasty departure of the subject from the place in which he then finds himself. The Evangelist could not have used the word in this sense, however, unless he were impressed with the notion that Joseph was already in Judea.

¹ [The order of events followed by the best recent authorities is, that the presentation took place on the fortieth day; that a very few days after this, the visit of the Magi occurred; and immediately succeeding that, the flight into Egypt.—ED.]

² Our view fully explains why Josephus could not know that this event was a measure of Herod's. He must have been a Christian, and initiated into the mysteries of the history of Christ's childhood, for the slaughter of the children of Bethlehem to have any political or historical significance in his eyes. It needs no explanation, that Herod, the murderer of his wife Mariamne, and of several of his sons (Alexander;

a bitter lamentation upon the heights of Bethlehem. It was as though Rachel, the ancestress of Israel, who was buried at Rama, not far from Bethlehem, had risen from her grave to bewail the woes of her children.

As soon as Herod was dead, and therefore not long after the flight into Egypt, Joseph was warned in a dream to return home again. The mental life of this remarkable man had been progressively perfecting in a peculiar manner, since he had come into the singular relation in which he stood to the most important facts and most glorious persons of the world's history. The noblest reverence for Mary, that ministering to her to which the providence of God had called him, anxious solicitude for the Holy Child entrusted to his protection, filled his heart with a tender awe when he was resting from the toils of the day during the hours of darkness, and made the night-side of his mental life a camera obscura for those divine directions which protected the life of the Holy Child. Through his fidelity to his trust, his character rose to the height of true Christian geniality, he became the night-watcher before the tent of the new-born Prince of mankind. That the angel of the Lord spoke to him only in dreams, is characteristic. But that these dreams were multiplied makes his character not improbable, but remarkable. And why should not even Joseph appear as a remarkable man in such a circle, under the impulse of such events? Even if not naturally such, he could not but become one. And when once he had entered upon such a course, how likely it was that many of the turning-points of his life should be reflected on and decided during the night-season! The Holy Child was the light of his midnights. But why, asks criticism, did not the angel of the Lord, at least, blend the two last prophetic dreams into one?

Psychologists, however, assert that prophetic dreams are never dialectic, but often rhythmical.

Scarcely, then, had the fugitives arrived in Egypt, than the danger was over, and the call to them to return went forth. They accordingly came again into the land of Israel.

Aristobulus, and Antipater), a despot, who, when his death drew near, caused the chief men of his kingdom to be imprisoned in the circus at Jericho, with the purpose of killing them at his death, that there might be a great mourning throughout the land, and concerning whom Augustus declared, that he would rather be the swine of Herod than his son—that so cruel a man should have been capable of the deed mentioned by the Evangelist. The passage in the heathen author Macrobius, confusing the history of the slaughter of the children of Bethlehem—which this author, who wrote at the end of the fourth century, might well have derived from Christian tradition—with the well-known political occurrence of the execution of Antipater, Herod's son, is, partly on account of this confusion, partly on account of the late date of the narrative, not calculated to be regarded as a testimony to this event. [On the silence of Josephus regarding the events of the Gospel narratives, see the judicious remarks of Ewald (*Christus*, 119, &c.), and the entirely satisfactory account of Mill (*Myth. Inter.* 289, &c.) The same author's criticism of the passage of Macrobius must be regarded as establishing, that the *bon mot* of Augustus is genuine, was uttered on the occasion of the massacre of Bethlehem, did not confound that massacre with the death of Antipater, which was ratified by the Emperor himself, and thus attests by *independent heathen tradition* the truth of the Gospel history. And even though Macrobius obtained his idea of the occasion and purport of the Emperor's jest from Christian tradition (which is most improbable), yet even thus it would be manifest that the massacre was accepted as historic fact.—ED.]

cf Ed
M Prof

NOTES.

1. The passages, Matt. i. 22, ii. 5, 16, 18, 23, in which Matthew speaks of strange fulfilments of Old Testament sayings, will be spoken of in their proper connection. But the remark already made by others, that the facts of the Gospel history are entirely independent of the exegesis of the Evangelist, must be made here. Or does criticism really assume that the Evangelist could not but be an infallible exeget? It is only when criticism makes such an assumption sincerely, and at the same time considers her own exegesis infallible in the points in which it differs from that of the Evangelist, that she can find that exegetical difficulties in such passages can cast a doubt upon historical facts. [The exegesis of Matthew is very thoroughly justified by Mill, p. 317, &c.—ED.]

2. Tradition has fixed the sojourn of the parents of Jesus in Egypt as near to Israel as possible. The Israelite temple of Onias was at Leontopolis, and the fugitives are said to have dwelt at Matara in its neighbourhood. The statement of the actual history is not affected by this tradition; it is rather the political extent of Egypt towards Palestine at the time of Christ, which should be considered in reviewing this event.

SECTION IX.

THE PRESENTATION OF JESUS IN THE TEMPLE.

(Luke ii.)

In His relation to the essential appointments of the Old Testament law, Jesus was an Israelite who exhibited a life passed in conformity to the law, under the impulses of liberty. It was not till death that He was released from Israelite responsibilities. Through the law, He died to the law, as Paul and His people generally did, in fellowship with Him. Till His death upon the cross, however, by which His nation thrust Him out into the world, He exhibited His divine liberty under the condition of Israelite religious national duty.

Thus also did Mary act with the Holy Child. It never struck her to claim exemption for her child from Jewish duties. She understood too well the signification of the manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh. From her stand-point, however, she could not take a part in the typical customs which the birth of the child required, with slavish devotion and admiration.

The circumcision of the child was simply performed eight days after His birth, the time appointed by the law. The sign of theocratic civilization¹ had no other import for the sacred body, without spot or blemish, than that it thus became free from blame in

¹ Comp. Winer's *R. W. B.*, Art. *Beschneidung*.

the eyes of the Jewish Church.¹ There was nothing to ennable in Him ; the angel had named Him Jesus before He was conceived in the womb. Thus He brought the nobility of the true circumcision or civilization of nature into the world with Him. Hence it was the most essential part of the ceremony that this name, *Jesus*, should now be given to Him. As the ceremony could only bear testimony to His native nobility, His name bore testimony to His true destiny.

It has been justly remarked, that the simple celebration of the circumcision of Jesus stands in remarkable contrast to the great festivities with which the circumcision of John was solemnized. John concluded the Old Covenant. In him the rite of circumcision solemnized its last glory. Jesus commenced the New Covenant. In His life the rite was only the performance of a national duty.

During the flight into Egypt, the time which must intervene between a birth and the rite of purification had elapsed. Hence, when the holy family returned home, their first business was to present the Child in the temple.

There were in this case two religious duties to fulfil. The greater of these was, that the Child, as a first-born son, must be offered to the Lord (Exod. xiii. 2; Num. xviii. 15, 16). As a first-born, He was regarded as a sacrifice, whose life belonged to the Lord, and must therefore be redeemed by a sacrifice. God had once inflicted death upon the first-born of Egypt and spared the first-born of Israel ; hence they were, in a special sense, dedicated to Him (Exod. xiii. 2). Therewith also was connected the notion, that the priesthood of the family was the duty of the first-born. Since, however, according to the theocratic appointment, the tribe of Levi represented the first-born of the nation in this duty, the redemption took place with reference to this obligation also (Num. xviii.) In the latter respect, the sacrifice seems to have been appointed to be rendered in money, viz., five shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary. It was thus that Jesus was now redeemed from the service of the temple, while His mother at the same time celebrated the rite of her purification. If the woman had borne a son, she was to offer a lamb forty days after, or, if she were poor, a pair of turtle-doves or young pigeons (Lev. xii. 8). According to the statement of the Evangelist, Mary brought the offering of the poor.

While the parents were offering their sacrifice in the temple, the aged Simeon² accosted and greeted them as though he had long known and waited for them. He took the child in his arms and praised God.

His prayer was indeed a swan's song : 'Lord, now lettest Thou

¹ [The imputation of our sin to Christ began at the moment 'He took our nature upon Him ; and being, as Mediator, subject to the law both in its requirements and penalty, His circumcision had a meaning in the eye of God as well as in the eye of the Church. It was the sign of subjection to the whole law in all its aspects.—ED.]

² He has been supposed, though without foundation, to have been Rabbi Simeon, the son of Hillel, and father of Gamaliel, who filled the office of president of the Sanhedrim after Hillel.

Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word ; for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation.' He rejoiced that he could now die happily. He is the noblest type of the Jewish, and especially of the prophetic mind. With deep sorrow does he seem to have lamented the fall of his nation ; a sorrow so deep, so tragically painful, that he could not die till his eyes had beheld the Messiah. God had, by the Spirit, given him a pledge that he should not die till he had seen the Christ. It was his joy, but also his sorrow. Hence is he, in the noblest sense, the wandering Jew of the Old Covenant, or rather its wandering Christologist. Now he is released from this fate. He has seen the Messiah ; he can now die. His song of praise in the temple has not a Jewish sound. He praises the Saviour, first, as the salvation prepared before the face of all nations, as a light to lighten the Gentiles ; he then calls Him the glory of His people Israel. Such words, especially in the mouth of an aged Jew, and spoken in the temple, testify to the most glorious presentiment of Gospel liberty. This is the form the Gospel takes with him. It is great, free, and world-embracing. But it is also very sad. Simeon blesses the parents of Jesus, and announces to Mary the sore conflict of the future. 'This child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign that shall be spoken against.' 'A sword shall pierce thine own soul also,' said he to Mary ; adding, with deep sorrow, the words, 'The thoughts of many hearts shall be revealed,' as though his eye penetrated the deep corruption of the Jewish hierarchy.

It was his gospel that he could fall asleep in the peace of his Lord before Good Friday came. What a character !

But how did he find the holy family ? A mysterious but powerful impulse of the Spirit had led him to the temple. And how could he distinguish the Holy Child from an ordinary child ? asks the critic. But who would judge of the prophetic glance of an aged man such as he was by his own feeble powers of discrimination ? Besides, Simeon saw the child with His mother. And thousands in the middle ages learned to know the glory of the child, through the noble form of the mother.¹

But why were the parents astonished at the words of Simeon concerning the child ? asks the critic again. Truly they already knew all ; they knew that the child was the Son of God. If nevertheless they were astonished, it was not because they heard perhaps an orthodox formula, but in free and heartfelt delight especially that God should have revealed this holy secret to Simeon. How often is it considered perfectly becoming to be astonished at the higher mysteries of this world ? The prophetess Anna now joins the group. She was an aged widow, the daughter of one Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser. She forms a striking contrast to the aged

¹ [This explanation rather mars than assists that just given. The statement of Luke (ii. 27), that Simeon came 'by the Spirit' into the temple, is of itself sufficient explanation of his recognition of the Messiah. Comp. the apocryphal account quoted by Ellicott, p. 67.—ED.]

Simeon. He was led by the Spirit to the temple. With her it was an old custom to continue in the temple, with prayer and fasting. He solemnly chanted forth his dying lay at the sight of Christ ; she gained fresh life and courage from the same sight, and began to publish the glad tidings to them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem. So different were these characters, and their believing reception of the Gospel, and yet they exhibited a unity, in which the true Messianic life of Israel greeted the Redeemer in the temple.

They who make teleology a reproach to us, and insist that when a butterfly, a hurricane, or even an historical event is in question, we must not inquire concerning its purpose, meet us here with the inquiry, what purpose could there be in bestowing so great a revelation upon these aged people?¹ They ask us, for what purpose does this old man, in his second childhood, thus dress himself in festal grave-clothes to chant his swan-like lay, and the aged Anna hasten again, like a bride, through the streets of Jerusalem ?

NOTE.

It is worthy of note, that even Neander (*Life of Christ*, p. 25) feels bound to defend the presentation in the temple. ‘Both (namely, the offering of the redemption-money for Jesus, and the sacrifice of purification for Mary) are striking when compared with the circumstances which preceded the birth of this child,’ &c. The Apostle Paul has entirely done away with anything that might be striking by that beautiful saying, ‘He thought it not robbery to be equal with God.’ If it should be felt a difficulty that Christ displayed His divine life amidst the restrictions of Judaism, it must seem quite as striking that He should display it amidst the restrictions of humanity. The glorification, however, of limitation was part of the purpose of His mission. While supranaturalistic prejudice is ever involuntarily criticising the full and sufficient form of Christ’s incarnation, and hence finding in such features of conformity to the law as occur in His life a kind of voluntary complaisance ; rationalistic critics would, on the contrary, often make Him display an antinomian spirit, nay, a spirit of opposition to Jewish ecclesiasticism. This arises from a want of appreciation for the distinction between the essential law and the scrupulous observance in Israel. Upon this distinction depends that glorious alternation between conformity to law, and liberty displayed in the life of Jesus, that infinite dexterity with which His pure walk was ever able to steer between the observance of law and the non-observance of scrupulous additions ;—to dance among eggs without breaking them, would but poorly express the difficulty of such a course.

¹ Strauss, i. 290. Comp. Ebrard, 175.

SECTION X.

THE SETTLEMENT IN NAZARETH.

(Luke ii. ; Matt. ii.)

The pious evangelist, Anna, may perhaps have spoken almost too much of the wondrous Child in Jerusalem. Archelaus was just the man to renew the attacks of his father upon the life of the Messiah. Augustus had not made him king, but only ethnarch of Judea. Though already warned, however, by an appeal of the people against his succession, he treated both Jews and Samaritans with cruel harshness. The danger to the holy family could not have been so great as to make it unsafe for them to enter Jerusalem; for Herod had not publicly persecuted the Messiah, and still less was this child of a poor mother publicly known as the Messiah. Nevertheless the holy family might have incurred danger by a continued sojourn under the sceptre of this despot. The grave expressions of Simeon concerning the sorrows in store for Mary, might have contributed to the anxieties of the parents of Jesus. Finally, a divine warning again vouchsafed to Joseph in a dream decided them on not remaining in Judea, and Mary was obliged to sacrifice her day-dream of bringing up her child for His high vocation in the city of David, to the divine guidance.

Joseph arose and turned aside into the parts of Galilee (ii. 22).

They returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth (Luke ii. 39).

Matthew found it difficult for his Jewish heart to reconcile itself to the fact that Jesus grew up in Nazareth. Hence he sought, above all things, to point out the harmony of this strange phenomenon with the Old Testament. It was with this motive that he wrote the significant sentence: He came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene. Matthew speaks, as it seems, from the point of view of a Galilean, who was abiding on the shores of the lake of Gennesareth, when the parents of Jesus again settled in Nazareth. It was then that the Messiah came into his neighbourhood, then first that He became a dweller in Nazareth. It is the main point with him that the Messiah, who had not yet dwelt in Nazareth, became by this settlement a Nazarene. In his purpose of bringing forth this fact, it is a matter of indifference to him that the parents of Jesus had also formerly dwelt there. But that Jesus should become a Nazarene, seems to him such a difficulty, that he cites the prophets collectively as witnesses to the fact that this was involved in the destiny of the Messiah.

They said, He shall be called a Nazarene. Neither an extinct saying of some prophet, nor any single prophetic utterance in general, can be here alluded to, and still less the similarity in

sound of the word Nezer (נֶצֶר Isa. xi. 1), the branch.¹ Nothing but a desperate desire to find an explanation at any cost could lay hold on the word Nazarite. It was only at a period when the word Nazarene was applied as a term of reproach to Christians, that the Evangelist, in a free and vivid interpretation of the Old Testament, could say, when contemplating the many passages in which the contempt the Messiah should be held in was declared, that Christ had been designated by the prophets as a Nazarene.² The full boldness and ingenuity of this declaration will be understood, when we consider that he wrote it for Jewish Christians, who were called Nazarenes, and perhaps also for Jews, who, in their prejudice, applied this name to Christians. He gave even Jews credit for not fastening upon such a sentence, in which all the prophets are said to concur, as a literal quotation from the prophetic writings.³

Though Jewish prejudice against Jesus was subsequently often fostered by the circumstance that He came from Nazareth, it was yet a master-stroke of divine wisdom that He should have grown up in that town. The retirement which concealed Him while He dwelt in one of the least noted districts, and among the least esteemed of the people, ensured the uninterrupted and original development of His unique life. It was as a miracle from heaven that this life was first to be displayed in the midst, and upon the high places, of Jewish popular life.

NOTE.

The often recurring assertion of modern criticism, that Matthew assumes that the parents of Jesus always lived in Bethlehem, before their settlement in Nazareth here mentioned, is supported, first, by the fact (chap. ii. 1), that the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem is spoken of without any previous mention of the journey of the parents. But since he had already spoken of Mary and Joseph in the first chapter, it might have been expected that the supposed assumption, with respect to their dwelling, would have come to light there, if it had really existed; while the fact of his not mentioning Bethlehem till he relates the birth of Jesus, seems rather to testify that he had

¹ This passage, taken in conjunction with Isa. liii. 2, might indeed occasion the Evangelist to find a special relation between the words Nezer and Nazareth. In both instances, the fresh life springing in silence, in one from the dry ground, in the other from contempt, form their single joint signification.

² E.g., Ps. cxviii. 22; Zech. xi. 13.

³ [Alford leaves this 'an unsolved difficulty.' The very erudite discussion of Mill (pp. 334-342) seems, however, to shed all requisite light upon it. He advocates the view, that this title referred to His being a *branch* of the root of David, but that this required Him to grow up slowly and unseen as a tender plant; therefore He was brought up in Nazareth. A town of which this was to be the fate, and which, purely in consequence of Christ's early residence there, should furnish first to Him and then to His followers one of their most familiar titles,—a title first bestowed contemptuously, yet accepted and recognized afterwards with very different feelings,—may well be conceived an object of the divine predestination and care from the first. Fitly, and providentially, therefore, was it so named, that when both our Lord and His followers were called Nazarenes, a title applied by the prophets to both was thus unconsciously conferred.]—ED.]

in view another place than the ordinary abode of the parents. His reason for not naming the latter may be explained by the intention of his Gospel. He would not unnecessarily state anything which might add to the difficulties of Jewish Christians. Hence he does not name Nazareth till the passage in which he is obliged to do so, and where he can appeal to a decided motive, and a divine direction. That Mary and Joseph had formerly dwelt at Nazareth, is, in this passage (chap. ii. 23), a merely accessory circumstance. It is worthy of observation, that the words, *He shall be called a Nazarene*, must be referred to Joseph, if the passage is interpreted in a strictly literal manner. But since all are agreed that the sentence refers to Jesus, it may be asked whether the change of subject takes place with the quotation, or before. At all events, it is in accordance with the whole passage to believe that the Evangelist had the Messiah in view in the words *καὶ ἐλθὼν κατώκησε*, even though he does not formally say so.

SECTION XI. THE FULFILMENTS.

(Matt. i. and ii.)

That the whole christological development of the ancient æon was fulfilled in Christ as the Prince of the new æon, that He was Himself the actual fulfilment of every exalted aspiration and effort that had preceded Him, is a doctrine announced by each and all of the apostles and Evangelists.

But a most intimate relation must prevail between the first beginnings and the perfection of the development of any definite life; it is but natural that the blossom and consummation of such development should be announced by frequent and most striking preludes. All the significant beginnings in the history of any celebrated life, will recur with increased force and ideality during the course of its development, and at length they will celebrate their fulfilment in the perfection of the maturity of this definite organic life.

When Christian Rome, in the days of its purely patriarchal rule in the West, poured forth the dawn of Christian civilization over the mass of nations enveloped in the night of heathen darkness, then were fulfilled the great things anticipatively sung by the poets of the Eternal City.

When Luther affixed his theses to the castle church of Wittenberg, then was fulfilled, preliminarily at least, the inspired call with which Arminius had invoked the heroes of Germany against the world-wide supremacy of Rome.

But the relation and similarity between beginning, middle, and end, are not only displayed in broad, general features, but often far more wonderfully in separate, nay, in very special particulars.

Natural philosophers have long known this great law of life ; it is beginning to dawn upon historians ; even theologians will have to acquaint themselves with it. When this is the case, many of the unfortunate critical remarks on significant references between the Old and New Testaments, will, at all events, come to nothing.

When the Evangelist Matthew was led, both by his own turn of mind and his vocation, to contemplate and exhibit, with the greatest distinctness, the fulfilment of the christological beginnings of the Old Testament in the life of Jesus, it could not escape his penetrating glance, that the general fulfilment of the divine-human life in Christ was surrounded by many particular fulfilments, that the corolla was adorned with a rich wreath of flower-leaves. This was not merely his peculiar way of viewing it, still less a weakness of rabbinical exegesis. Even John was acquainted with this vital law, that the prelude reappears in the completion. He saw, e.g., the speaking circumstance, that not a bone of the crucified Saviour, the antitype of the pascal lamb, was broken. In both cases, too, this happened from the same reason : it was during the world's midnight hour, and under violent excitement of mind, that the sacrifice took place ; it was no time for the performance of customary ceremonies or usages. Matthew then found the history of Christ's infancy rich in such prophetic features. In the birth of the Redeemer, the true Immanuel, of the Virgin, he rightly saw (Matt. i. 22, 23) the fulfilment of that prophetic scene in Isaiah (Isa. vii. 14) in which the birth of the son of a virgin-mother, and the circumstance that she should call his name Immanuel, was, as we have already seen, held forth to king Ahaz as a sign of deliverance. The birth of Christ was the fulfilment of this scene in a threefold respect : the virginity of the mother, the heroic courage and redeeming love, and the consecration of the new-born child to be a sign and assurance of deliverance, but also, especially, the entire uniqueness of these three typical incidents were in this case perfect. With a free view of its meaning does the Evangelist quote also the passage in which Micah (v. 1) had announced the theocratic glory of Bethlehem. He, as well as the Jewish scribes, rightly applies it to the birth of Christ at Bethlehem. These words pointed out, not merely as a typical, but as a conscious prophecy, that the Messiah would be born at Bethlehem. Nay, this passage is a key to other passages whose reference is more obscure. The Governor of Israel is here designated as Him *whose goings forth or beginnings*¹ have been from of old, and from everlasting ; therefore, as *the essential fulfilment*. When Matthew was contemplating the flight of the parents of Jesus to Egypt, for the preservation of the Holy Child, and their return thence (chap. ii. 15), not only did the saying of Hosea (Hos. xi. 1)—Out of Egypt have I called My Son—wherein God is stating His relation to the infancy of the people of Israel—appear to him highly significant ; but also the actual similarity, that the typical son, the nation, in which the

¹ מוצאתה

true Son was enclosed as the essence of its being, was called out of Egypt, and that now the true Son of God, with whom even the deliverance of the typical one recurred, should be called out of the same country. He even saw the recurrence and awful fulfilment of what was terrible in the history of Israel, when the prince who sat on David's throne slew the children of Bethlehem in order to destroy that great Son of David, who, according to promise, was to be Israel's Saviour and Deliverer. This occurrence recalled to his mind the terrible ruin of his nation, and the sad delusion of the reigning house. It had once, indeed, seemed to the prophet Jeremiah, when he saw in the Spirit the children of Israel led captive to Babylon, as though Rachel, their ancestress, were rising from her tomb in Rama to bewail her unhappy children, as though the lamentation of a spirit were resounding in heart-breaking tones upon the tops of the mountains ; but Matthew felt that this incident, the slaughter of the children, was sadder than even that, that the troubles of his nation had now reached their climax, and that its faithful ancestress had now more reason than ever to be disturbed in her grave, and to lift up her voice in lamentation for her children. Such, however, is the Evangelist's spiritual liberty in his view of the relations between the Old and New Testaments, that he forms expressions according to actual circumstances, and reads sayings in the prophets which no literalist, but only a discerning child of the theocratic spirit, could read in them. Jesus grows up in Nazareth—the Messiah, the heir of all the promises, in that despised corner of Galilee—what a heavy cross to Jewish pride ! Well, thinks Matthew, I find this despised origin, which obscures the Messiah to the carnal eye, pointed out in the prophets, in the rod that is to spring from the roots of Jesse, and elsewhere, so clearly that I am certain the prophets have, in the spirit of the words, declared that he shall be called a Nazarene. In a word, he meets the Nazarene everywhere in the writings of the prophets. So practical an eye, looking upon the life of Jesus, could not but behold it richly adorned with fulfilments of Old Testament christological notions of every kind.

NOTE.

Having pointed out the general notion of these prophecies, it would be needless to dwell further on that exegetical treatment of the passages in question, which depends upon a misconception of the organic nature of prophecy.

SECTION XII.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF JESUS.

(Luke ii.)

Jesus was, and remained, a Nazarene, till He was over thirty years of age. Hence He passed the greater part of His glorious life

in retirement. It is a testimony to the infinite delicacy and secrecy of His divine greatness, to that revealing concealment of true majesty, which can escape the vulgar eye in broad daylight, that no Nazarene was so struck by His appearance as to become the Evangelist of His youth ; but it is, at the same time, also a testimony to the dull state of popular life in Nazareth. The only trustworthy information we possess concerning Christ's development, is probably derived from the reminiscences of Mary. Thus the whole of our Lord's useful life is covered by a general obscurity ; while the one history which Luke has preserved in the narrative of the occurrence of His twelfth year, sheds the only ray which penetrates this darkness, a ray shining, on the one side, as far as the birth of Jesus, and on the other, as His baptism in Jordan.

Situate between the heights of the miraculous birth of Christ, and the solemnization of the perfection of His Messianic consciousness by the testimony of God and the recognition of John the Baptist, only such an incident as that communicated could be in keeping ; a sun-enlightened peak, corresponding in its brightness and sublimity with those heights, and displaying by its features and style that it belongs to the same mountain chain.

The Evangelist Luke first gives us a general sketch of the development of Jesus : 'The child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom ; and the grace of God was upon Him.' He then exhibits this development of Jesus in a most speaking fact.

The history of Jesus at twelve years of age represents His whole development. It is the characteristic act of His boyhood, the revelation of His youthful life,—a reflection of the glory of His birth, a token of His future heroic course. It exhibits the childhood of His ideality, and therefore the ideality of childhood in general.

When Jewish boys were twelve years old, they accompanied their kinsfolk to the great festivals at Jerusalem, and were called by a great name : Children of the Thorah, of the Law. Hence the parents of Jesus took Him with them as soon as He had reached this stage of life. When the festival was over, they returned among the Galilean company to Nazareth. But the child remained behind in Jerusalem. The parents first missed their Son when they took up their quarters for the night, after the first day's journey, and found Him again, after three days' anxious search, in the temple.

But how was it possible for them, and especially for Mary, to have been thus separated for three days from the child ? A single moment would be sufficient for such a contingency—a moment in which the young eagle unconsciously lost sight of His mother ; while she, the dependent wife, who was with Joseph and his relations, followed in the beaten track, and under the supposition that her child would also remain in the company of the Galilean travellers, suffered Him to disappear from her immediate circle.

Mary has been reproached with this incident. But this has resulted from want of appreciating its serious, nay, sad, significance. Mary was placed under domestic and family ties which exercised a

power over her. The bloom of her inner life was of a New Testament character ; while, as a Jewess, she was rooted, by both duty and custom, in the Old Testament.

Thus was Mary, who once more in after days betrayed, in presence of her holy Son, traces of womanly weakness, and dependence on Joseph's family (Mark iii. 31), carried forward by the rules of the Nazarene travellers ; while the child—He knew not how—fell out of the train of boys, and went on, led by the Spirit, meditating, longing, attracted, and carried along by His own infinite thoughts, until He stood in the temple, in the midst of the Rabbis.

The separation of the mother and child did not therefore require much time. The pilgrims marched in companies or parties, which were again divided into separate bands. The parents of Jesus had seen the band of boys formed, and supposed that their Son had set off with it, according to custom. This mistake of a moment was sufficient to separate them from Him for three days. It was not till the end of the first day's journey that they could miss Him, when seeking Him at the common resting-place among His companions. The second day was occupied in returning. On the third they found Him in the temple.

They were, however, in the highest degree surprised, nay, amazed, to find the child in such a situation. He was sitting in the midst of a circle of Rabbis, listening to their instructions, and questioning them. A circle of wondering listeners surrounded Him ; they were astonished at His understanding and answers.

But how could Jesus come into this connection with the Rabbis ? We are informed that the pupils of the Rabbis were not suffered to sit in the presence of their teachers till a period subsequent to this.¹ This information is, however, regarded as doubtful. They suffered this unknown boy to sit in their midst. He was even permitted to question them, and thus to use an agency which might easily be converted into teaching, and which on this occasion probably became a difficult test to the Rabbis. The Rabbis of our days would not perhaps have suffered this ; but the Rabbis of those days had not yet lost all feeling for the prophetic spirit, though they were fast stiffening into the death of formalism. They might well remember the boys Joseph, Samuel, and David, when they met with an unusually gifted boy. Besides, they might have been very glad to obtain distinguished pupils. At all events, these Rabbis suffered themselves to be for the moment carried away by the glorious and marvellous boy. The genius of the new human race overcame these heroes of ancient etiquette. Their better Israelite and human feelings made them

¹ Comp. Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte*, p. 217. Even if this information should be regarded as correct, it would cast no difficulty upon the passage. It would rather prove that etiquette, with respect to scholastic deportment in the schools of the Rabbis, was, in the days of Jesus, in a state of transition. If it subsequently became a rule that scholars should sit, why should it not now have taken place exceptionally, in the case of a very promising boy who was not yet a scholar, and whom perhaps the Rabbis might hope to obtain, to make Him an honour to Phariseeism ?

for the moment delighted with the intelligent and inquiring boy, and they made Him sit in their midst.¹ He listened to and questioned them, giving a wholesome agitation to their scholastically formed and settled opinions by the expression of His vigorous and childlike thoughts.²

It was thus that His parents found Him. Joseph was truly concerned for the Holy Child who had been entrusted to him ; but one can easily understand that he would feel, in a still greater degree, a great and decided reverence for the Rabbis in the temple at Jerusalem. How many a time may he not, more or less, have lost sight of the future divine hero in the poor and often silent boy ? And now he finds Him in the midst of the doctors of Jerusalem, perhaps unconsciously pressing upon them both strongly and sharply the great questions of the inner life of religion. He was amazed at the sight, as was Mary also. It is quite consistent with the actual relations between Christ and His parents, that they should not have been able to keep pace with Him in spiritual matters. Yet every incident in which they saw Him on the steep path of life suddenly looking down upon them from a dizzy overhanging height, must have the more struck and surprised them, inasmuch as He was so thoroughly humble and submissive, so silent concerning the wonders of His inner life in His intercourse with them. If we cannot but find in the disposition of Joseph a secret complaisance in the boy's elevation, we may still more imagine what a terror of joy took possession of Mary. But how did she penetrate beyond the court of the women ? and how came it that she anticipated her husband, and was the first to speak in presence of the Rabbis ? Fortunately these difficulties have, as yet, escaped our critics. How vivid are these touches ! The anxious mother is the first to press forward. Joseph, however, has not yet grown to the comprehension of this scene ; he maintains a reverential silence. Mary asks the boy : 'Son, why hast Thou thus dealt with us ? behold, Thy father and I have sought Thee, sorrowing.' And He replies, 'How is it that ye sought Me ? wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business ?' And they understood not the saying which He spake unto them.

The boy asked, with most genuine naïveté, 'Could you then seek Me ? Did you not know that I am at home here ?'³ The temple on Moriah is to Him still identical with His Father's house, the interpretation of

¹ Strauss, vol. i. 310, expresses the view, that the sitting on the ground, which Paul designates (Acts xxii, 3) as the respect of a pupil to a teacher, forms a contradiction to this sitting of Jesus in the midst of the doctors. Why should it be impossible to sit on the ground in the midst of a circle of seats ? Moreover, we may probably grant to these Rabbis sufficient homage for the genius of the boy to induce them to offer Him a seat. Schöttgen seats Him on a little throne ; it is questionable whether he does not give the Rabbis credit for too much. Others will not suffer Him to sit quietly on the floor, but disturb Him for the sake of rabbinical etiquette. We may at least claim for Him a little stool.

² Jewish Rabbis could perhaps most easily answer the inquiry, whether the questioning of the boy implies teaching, properly so called, and whether a mass of difficulties against the historical statement do not arise, from a rabbinical point of view.

³ Compare Stier's *Words of the Lord Jesus*, i. 21 (Clark's Tr.)

the Old Testament with His Father's word, and intercourse with the Rabbis with His Father's presence. This place still exercises upon His religious feeling the full power of a heavenly home ; and He cannot understand that His parents should have set off, and then, when they missed Him, not immediately have sought Him here. At all events, He expresses the whole theology of His own nature, yet not in the form of matured consciousness, but in the truest type of the dawning notions of genuine childhood. Time had escaped Him in the happy hours He had spent there ; but He now listens and questions from the stand-point of His parents. He does not desire to excuse Himself for having forgotten the whole world in His Father's house ; but He allows Himself to be informed of the anxiety they had suffered, because they did not know of His doings in the temple. Mary speaks of His father Joseph, but He speaks of the irresistible drawing of His Father in heaven. It is the dawning feeling of that sonship which was His alone—a feeling still enveloped, however, in the bud of childlikeness, which expresses, without intending it, the great contrast between the earthly and the heavenly father. The consciousness of His heavenly Father's omnipresence is still enveloped in the bud of childlike devotion, which seeks the Father in His temple ; and His gradual self-reflection upon the depths of the divine life within Him is still veiled under the childlike simplicity with which, impelled by sincere confidence and thirst after knowledge, He proposes His questions to the fathers of Jewish theology.

But the test of a childlike purity corresponding with the presentation of His great destiny, lies in the fact that He should, when bidden by His parents to depart for Nazareth, so immediately leave the place where He had plunged so deeply into the nature of His Father, and had, in this experience, comprehended His own ; the place of which He had but just said : It is here that I am at home. He entered into their ways of life, and freely followed their guidance. Certainly the saying, He was subject to them, means fully as much as this ; and how happy must He be esteemed in His humble obedience ! Under the shadow of the temple of Jerusalem, He must either have become a disciple of the Pharisees, or rather, since this was an impossibility, He would have reached His goal too early by opposing the pharisaic spirit. In Nazareth, on the contrary, another of His Father's houses—the greatness, the sacredness of nature—was opened to Him, for the development of His consciousness. Here He could search the Scriptures without the obscuring glosses of the Rabbis ; instead of intercourse with spiritually dead scribes, could commune with the ever-living spirits of the prophets ; while Mary His mother, the chosen one, who pondered in her heart all that befell Him, was more to Him than all the priests of the temple. She beheld with maternal delight how He grew in wisdom and stature, and in favour both with God and man. Though she often sank below that high and perfect state of inspiration in which she had brought forth her holy Son, yet, according to the prevailing

feature of her life, she must have risen towards Him, when He went down to Nazareth with her.

If the child had not expressed His ideal of continually dwelling in the temple, He would have been enslaved by the force of Old Testament customs. If, on the contrary, He had insisted on maintaining this ideal, in opposition to the higher ideality of following the divine will, in the performance of domestic duty, He would have trodden the path of self-will. Both were impossible. His free submission is a prelude to the great prayer in Gethsemane. Jesus there, according to the true meaning of the prayer, once more asks of His Father, whether the ideal of a Messiah free from suffering, and dwelling upon Zion, were a possibility ; but He finds the answer in the depths of His own breast, and becomes again, with perfect and free submission, the Nazarene, even to death upon the cross.

We have pointed out, in what has been already advanced, the education under which the development of Jesus took place. The notions, that Jesus perhaps picked up somewhat of the far-famed wisdom of Egypt, during His flight thither, while still a sportive child—that He was secretly a disciple of the Essenes,—as well as other similar conjectures, have their foundation in the general tendency of ‘Philisterism,’ to explain the very highest kind of life by mere scholastic reasoning, to attribute the greatest human originality to a compound of the effects of lesser minds. It has been already shown, that the Essenes were anything but genuine Israelites. The Messiah might appear, be crucified, and die in the midst of His people, without their appreciating or observing Him from their schismatic corner.

If education is looked upon as an influence upon the life of the scholar, by which his character receives many elements from the circle of ideas and the reflections of his teacher, and by which his views are variously modified, we may unhesitatingly declare of Jesus, that His healthy nature totally withheld all education of this kind. Himself so powerfully and purely original, He was incapable of taking into His nature false or obscure impressions even of theology and history. It was only the objective and the actual which could find an entrance into His mind : what was false rebounded from the elasticity of His heavenly-minded moral nature, and then appeared before Him objectively, as one of the world’s delusions, as a medium for perfecting His knowledge of the world.

But if we view education as a means of unfolding the inner nature of the scholar by appropriate influences and communications, as the organic excitement of his development, and as feeding his inner life with such a measure of the facts of the outer world as the exigencies of a healthy vital process of assimilation require, no one enjoyed a richer education and cultivation than Jesus.

As Luther once bestowed upon a bird the title of Doctor, because it had taught him confidence, so far rather did Jesus receive from the fowls of heaven and the lilies of the field the most instructive and most cheering of Heaven’s teachings. All nature became to

Him a transparent symbol of eternal truth, the developed counterpart, the mirror of that divine fulness which was discovering itself within Him ; and He found on the hills of Galilee a glorious sanctuary, which compensated Him for the courts of the temple.

Even everyday life was a school of instruction to Him. The price of a sparrow in the market was connected in His mind with the highest interests of the human soul. He beheld all things in their twofold relations ; that is, according to their import in the world, and their import in the government and mind of God.

In the stupidity of the people, in all the misunderstandings and misinterpretations, which the manifestation of His purity could not fail to elicit, the dark side of the world, the deep corruption of the human race, was early made manifest to Him. Very early must He, after a glance at Israel and the world, have turned with a sigh to His Father in the sense of those words of gloomy foreboding : *a dark spirit runs through this house.*

The Old Testament offered Him the same solution which He found in His own mind. ‘The Scriptures testify of Me,’ said He. He found their utterances identical with His own consciousness, nay, even parallel with its development. Their christological development reached its climax in His own life : He was Himself their last word, their key. The progress of His development was a progress through the stages of their life ; hence He penetrated their deepest meaning, as proved, *e.g.*, by His explanation of the brazen serpent, of the announcement of God as the God of Abraham, and His masterly quotation of many Old Testament passages against the Pharisees. The Old Testament was to Him the fullest prophecy of His own life.

Undoubtedly the journeys which Christ annually made to Jerusalem after His twelfth year, had great influence in the development of His consciousness. The acquaintance of the boy with the doctors seems not to have increased from year to year. His first visit to Jerusalem was sufficient to enable Him to penetrate the whole corruption of the existing temple-system.

The life of His mother Mary, however, only needed to be understood as His mind could understand it, to appear as a bright picture of a happy life in God. His intercourse with her was the most refined and noblest means of promoting His development. Her humility, love, and faith appeared before Him in a mature, though not a perfect aspect, and therefore could not but exert a powerful influence upon His soul. She was to Him also in a special sense a type of the elect, of that higher and nobler humanity which the Father had given to Him ; hence a type of His Church. Certainly the kindly intercourse between Christ and His mother Mary, was the noblest element of His human education and development. Who can portray the great and deep joy of this connection, the words of mutual help and encouragement which could not but be uttered in the intercourse of these hearts, or the unspeakably acute sorrow which must have burned like fire at a white heat in both, when Mary, in weaker moments, could not understand the faith of

her Son, when the Jewess opposed the Christian in her breast? In decisive moments, Christ placed her in a high position. Under the rule of His Spirit, she was held sacred in the youthful days of the Gospel, in the youthful days of the Church. But He could not have given a more touching or lovelier testimony to the character of her mind, than He uttered from the cross in His legacy of love, a love infinitely abundant even in the agonies of death—the legacy by which He made John her son, and her his mother. But though Mary might lead the Lord to the entrance of the Holy of Holies, no intercourse could be so promotive of His inner life as intercourse with His Father.

The perfection of His intercourse with the Father, whether displayed in the entire unreserve of face-to-face dialogue, or in those monologues in which His very soul was poured forth, this vitality of prayer casts a bright ray upon the holy night of His childhood, making it clear to us, that in proportion to His development, He could not but be found in His Father's house, His Father's bosom, in His love and presence, nay, could not but find His Father in His whole being. His whole life was developed in God—as one prayer of infinite depth—one deep sigh for the world's salvation—one loud hallelujah for the saving love manifesting itself in Him—one continuous amen of obedience, and surrender to the guidance of His Father. Thus was His development in the life of prayer perfected.

It might then well seem, to modest minds, an infinitely difficult task to define exactly the degree of development which such a mind might attain at the age of twelve. The observations of those who have found the boy placed at too great an elevation, have been met by examples of precociously great minds; the remark has also been made, that an Oriental child of twelve would equal a Western one of fifteen in degree of development; but the opponents of the historic Gospel have not given up their objections.¹ Though they can hardly recognize a developed Church Christology in the sayings of Christ during the ministrations of His manhood, they find it, strange to say, in the expression: I must be in what is My Father's. They think that a child of twelve could not have spoken so theologically.² An unprejudiced consideration, however, of the whole expression, shows that the morning dew of childhood still lies upon every word; such complete naiveté, that a sophist could subsequently adduce it

¹ Compare my essay *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter der kanonischen Evangelien*, pp. 120 ff.—Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit*, p. 221.

² Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 313. ‘We might take this designation of God as *τοῦ πατρὸς* indefinitely, as showing that He would represent God as the Father of all men, and only in this sense as His also.’—This is said to be the description of a religious feeling.—‘But not only are we forbidden so to understand it by the appended *μοῦ*, which in this sense would have been (as in Matt. vi. 9) *ἡμῶν*, but chiefly by the fact, that the parents of Jesus did not understand this saying, &c. But that a consciousness of His Messiahship should have been manifested in Jesus at twelve years of age,’ &c. The writer seems to have no notion that there is a form of the inner life called anticipation, a mid-region between unconsciousness and manifested consciousness; that this form of life is peculiar to mature childhood, and shows itself in gifted children in significant expressions, containing more than the speakers know with certainty.

in support of the opinion, that this boy spoke in too childish a manner to represent the Prince of mankind at the age of twelve. How indefinitely obscure is the saying: I must be in those (things, places, or affairs) that are my Father's (*ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου*)! How childlike is the assumption, that this being in the Father's sphere was identical with a sojourn in the temple! And how sudden is the transition from the genuine Zionite ideal to unlimited obedience! In such alternations of frame, we recognize a genuine childlike nature, though certainly a nature coming up to the standard of ideal childhood, and representing, in its bounding freedom, the young lion; in its swift obedience, the tender lamb.

NOTES.

1. From the present history, we learn that the parents of Jesus generally went together to the Passover at Jerusalem. This certainty is derived from the words: His parents. But it does not follow that Joseph might not have frequented the other great annual festivals. It is probable that Jesus had frequently gone up to the feasts at Jerusalem before His public appearance, and that the intercourse with pilgrims, priests, and scribes, which such journeys involved, was undoubtedly one great element of His development, and of preparation for His ministry.

2. And when He was twelve years old (*ὅτε ἐγένετο ἔτῶν δώδεκα*), says the Evangelist. Strauss here alternately uses the expressions: in His twelfth year, and Jesus was twelve years old. Neander says he had entered His twelfth year. This inaccuracy must be avoided. If Jesus were born in the early months of the year, He had probably entered His thirteenth year.

3. The text gives us occasion to imagine a distinct grouping of the pilgrim caravans, and indeed such a one as enforced the separation of a boy from his parents on the return journey. This leads to the view of a separate company of boys.

4. Strauss makes the following objection to the early development of Jesus related in the present narrative (vol. i. 313): 'For, though the consciousness of a more subjective vocation, as of poet, artist, &c., in which all depends upon the individual being gifted with early susceptibility, might possibly very soon manifest itself; yet an objective vocation, in which actual occurrences form a chief factor, such as the vocation of statesman, general, reformer of religion, could hardly become so clear, even in the most gifted individual; because such a knowledge of given circumstances is needed for it, as longer observation and more matured experience alone could afford. But it is to the latter kind that a vocation to be the Messiah belongs,' &c. The same writer also says, in his article, *Vergängliches und Bleibendes in Christenthum*, p. 109 ff, A late penetrating observer rightly finds a main difference between human natures and endowments, in the circumstance that some feel an impulse and vocation to go out of themselves, and objectively to exhibit that which lives within them in works of art or science, in deeds of war or peace; while others, shut up in themselves, strive

to make their inner nature unanimous with itself, to exercise, to cultivate its various powers, and thus to form their own life to a rich harmonious work of art. Now Christ belonged in the fullest and highest sense to this (latter) class of natures. Accustomed as we are to be astonished at the rapid turns of ‘criticism,’ we can but be astonished once more. So then, in the former, as well as in the latter work, the author gives the same classification of the great minds of the world’s history. But in the one, he places Christ in the class of those who have an objective, and in the other, of those who have a more subjective vocation. By this flagrant contradiction he gains a double advantage. He can first (presumptively at least) apply the theory of the objective vocation of Christ, as an argument against the development of Jesus at twelve years of age. But then he can afterwards, by connecting Him with the geniuses of the world, bring the Christ of more subjective gifts into a class which, in some measure, secures Him from being mixed up with the often impure ‘heroes of war and politics,’ and thus weaken the reproofs he might have expected.

Bruno Bauer, speaking against the early development of Jesus, says, vol. i. p. 65, ‘A twelve-years-old boy is a twelve-years-old boy in every region under heaven.’¹

SECTION XIII.

THE FAMILY RELATIONS OF JESUS.

Joseph, the foster-father of Jesus, must undoubtedly have died between the first journey of Jesus to Jerusalem and His first entrance upon His public ministry,—that is, between his twelfth and thirtieth years. For on that journey he was still accompanying Mary; while in the history of Christ’s public life he is nowhere

¹ [In some recent ‘Lives of Jesus,’ notice has been taken of His bodily appearance. This has from the first been matter of dispute; some of the fathers maintaining, that if the prophecy of Isaiah (chap. liii.) was fulfilled in Him, His appearance must have been far from beautiful or attractive. Others denied that any such inference was necessary. The various opinions have been collected and conveniently arranged by Le Nourry in his *Dissertationes in Clem. Alex.* (Dis. i. iv. art. 4). The traditions of supernaturally originated pictures are some centuries too late to claim consideration. The interesting fragment, however, preserved from very ancient times, and claiming to be the description of a contemporary (the proconsul Lentulus), embodies the leading features of that idea of our Lord’s appearance which the greatest painters have adopted or conceived. ‘There appeared in these our days a man of great virtue named Jesus Christ, who is yet living amongst us, and of the Gentiles is accepted for a prophet of truth, but his own disciples call him the Son of God. He raiseth the dead, and cureth all manner of diseases. A man of stature somewhat tall and comely, with a very reverend countenance, such as beholders may both love and fear; his hair the colour of a filbert full ripe, somewhat curling or waving about his shoulders; his forehead plain and delicate; his face without spot or wrinkle; his beard thick and short; his eyes gray, clear, and quick; in reproving awful, in admonishing courteous, in speaking very modest and wise. None have ever seen him laugh, but many have seen him weep—a man for his beauty surpassing the children of men.’ This extract will be found in Clark’s *Travels*, vol. iv. 177; or Lord Lindsay’s *Christian Art*, vol. i. p. 77. In connection with this, should be read the wise counsel of Augustine regarding the use to be made of ideas of our Lord’s personal appearance (*De Trinitate*, viii. 3-8).—ED.]

met with, not even at the marriage of Cana. More definite information concerning the time of his departure is hardly to be obtained. No artizan ever performed so great things as he. He is the prince of craftsmen; unless, indeed, Christ, of whom tradition says that He worked in wood, and whom even the Nazarenes called (according to Mark vi. 3) the carpenter, were so Himself. But we shall return to this question.

After Joseph's death, Mary was not left alone with Jesus. His brethren are often spoken of in the Gospels,¹ and in a connection which plainly shows that they formed one family with Mary and Joseph. According to John ii. 12, His brethren accompanied Him, together with Mary and His disciples, from Nazareth to Capernaum. They are placed before His disciples, for Jesus had not as yet assumed any public character. Mary and His brethren seem to have accompanied Him in the character of His domestic circle. Still greater prominence is given to this circle in the scene (Mark iii. 20), where He is occupied with the multitudes in the full activity of His ministry, and His adversaries are already opposing Him with undisguised malice. His friends, or His family (*οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ*), it is said, went out to lay hold on Him, for they said, He is beside Himself. Undoubtedly, these persons were the same of whom it is said, ver. 32, Thy mother and Thy brethren without seek for Thee.

In what relation, then, did Jesus stand to these brethren?

To answer this question is a perplexing task; since the hints which must decide it are but scantily given in the New Testament. The matter, too, which is difficult enough in itself, has been still further perplexed by various and opposing dogmatic prepossessions. From the midst of this confusion, however, four chief hypotheses appear.

The first explanation of the circumstance, supposes that these brethren of Jesus were His own brothers on the mother's side; sons of the marriage of Joseph and Mary, born after Jesus. The expression, brethren (*ἀδελφοί*), whose constant use in pointing out family connections, at all events, suffers us to infer brotherly relationship in a narrower sense, favours this view.² Besides, it is said (Matt. i. 25) of Mary, Joseph knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son; and (Luke ii. 7) she brought forth her first-born son. The remark on the connection between Joseph and Mary, seems to point to subsequent marital association; the appellation, her first-born son, seems to relate to brothers born subsequently. This view is especially favoured by Protestants, in opposition to the Romish veneration of Mary, and declaration of her perpetual virginity.

The opposite view understands by the brethren of Jesus His cousins. It arises from the general assumption, that the word *brother* was often used by the Hebrews in a wider sense, and con-

¹ Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 55; Mark iii. 31, vi. 3; John ii. 12, vii. 3, 5; Luke viii. 19; Acts i. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5; Gal. i. 19.

² This view has lately been defended with much skill and diligence by Ph. Schaf, in his essay, *das Verhältniss des Jakobus, Bruders des Herrn zu Jakobus Alphæe*, Berlin, 1843.

sequently included the ἀνεψιός, the cousin or relation. It finds, however, a safer starting-point in the passage, John xix. 25. Here, according to the prevailing view of the passage, Mary the wife of Cleophas, is represented as sister of Mary the mother of Jesus. We cannot, however, avoid considering the names Cleophas and Alpheus identical, when so pressing an occasion for doing so as this occurs.¹ For the same Mary is, in Matt. xxvii. 56, spoken of as the mother of James and Joses. Now, there was among the disciples one bearing the name of James the son of Alpheus, James the son of this Mary. But if Joses were his brother, as appears also from Mark xv. 40, we have already two of the names appearing in the list of Jesus' brethren. We have next to consider the circumstance, that the author of the Epistle of Jude calls himself the servant of Jesus Christ, the brother of James. He is undoubtedly the same who is mentioned by Luke in the apostolic catalogue as Jude the brother of James. This James, however, cannot be James the Great, since he is always connected with his brother John. But if he were James the Less, Jude, as well as James and Joses, is also a son of Alpheus. Now the brethren of Jesus are called James, Joses,² Juda, and Simon (Mark vi. 3). If, then, we here introduce the information of Eusebius and Hegesippus, that Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, who suffered martyrdom under Trajan, was a son of Cleophas, we have four sons of Cleophas who bear the same names as the brethren of Jesus. Thus the brethren of Jesus were His cousins.

The third view is, that Joseph had been married before his espousal to Mary, and that it is the children of this marriage whom Matthew and Mark call the brethren of Jesus. This view is founded upon apocryphal legends. According to some of these legends,³ Joseph is said to have had a wife named Esha; according to others, Salome; and to have had by her four sons, James, Joses, Simon, and Juda, and two daughters, Esther and Thamar; according to others, Mary and Salome, the mother of Zebedee's children. This opinion was defended by many fathers and theologians, especially by Origen and Grotius. It has been remarked against it, that it seems to have arisen from merely doctrinal prejudices, viz., for the sake of harmonizing the scriptural account of the brothers and sisters of Jesus with notions of the immaculate purity of Mary. But, at any rate, it explains, in a simple manner, on one hand, the family relationship of these four brethren to Jesus, and, on the other, the circumstance that they nowhere appear in the Gospel in the intimate relation of own brethren to Him, and especially that the names of his sisters are not once mentioned.

Finally, the references in the Gospels, of James the Less to his father Alpheus, of Mary the wife of Cleophas to her sons James and

¹ Alpheus . . . a Joanne Κλωπᾶς appellatur. Hebraicum בְּלִפְנֵי a Matth. et Marco abjecta aspiratione, Ἀλφαῖος efferebatur, ut Hagg. i. 1, Πέτρος a LXX. Ἄγαιος, a Joanne vero Κλωπᾶς, Πέτρος mutata in K, &c., redditur.—So Bretschneider's Lexicon.

² According to Lachmann's reading, Matt. xiii. 55, Ἰωσήφ.

³ Comp. Schaf, *das Verhältniss*, &c., p. 35.

Joses, of the Jude who wrote the Epistle bearing his name to James, have caused others to regard the four brethren of Jesus and their sisters as children of Mary the wife of Cleophas and of Joseph, through a Levirate marriage, for the purpose of raising up seed, to the childless Cleophas, the brother of Joseph. Theophylact, among others, supported this view. This would very well explain why only James should be decidedly mentioned as the son of Alpheus, while the rest of the brethren and sisters of Jesus are not so described. But as Schaf rightly remarks, the absurdity and unfitness of a double marriage on Joseph's part, speaks against this view. In this case, Joseph would have been husband at the same time to the widow of his brother and to the mother of Jesus, for there seems no reason to suppose that he had separated from the latter.

Not wishing to bestow too large a space upon this question, we but briefly communicate the result of our view of the family relations of Jesus, accompanied by a statement of the reasons which have determined it.

That Mary lived after the birth of Jesus in marital intercourse with Joseph, in the stricter sense, seems to result from the passage cited. It cannot, however, be certainly concluded from it, since it only directly denies the fact of such intercourse having taken place before the birth of Christ.¹ The designation of her son as the first-born, seems to be an emphatic expression, by no means intended to point out that she afterwards had other sons. The Evangelist could not here have been thinking of these sons, if she had had them. The uniqueness of this child wholly filled his mind. Christ is the first-born of the new human race, or rather the prince-born of mankind, and of the world. Paul calls Him so (Col. i. 15), and why should not the Evangelist also thus name Him in a New Testament sense? The evangelical expression concerning the birth of Christ runs thus in Luke :² ἐτεκε τὸν γιὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον. With Vater we read αὐτῆς, and translate, she brought forth her son, who was her own, the first-begotten.

The Romish Church denies the sexual intercourse of the holy couple, in order to preach the perpetual virginity of Mary. Even Joseph is raised to the condition of perpetual virginity.³ We do not entertain those doctrinal prejudices which require such a view; and for this reason, that the ethic notion of virginity stands higher with us than the physical. The view of virginity which cannot rise above the physical notion, has led to many coarse discussions and definitions. But though in this inquiry we may insist on laying special weight upon Mary's frame of mind, though we conceive that her state of heavenly inspiration raised her far above the region of matrimonial relations, yet we must not forget that Mary was the wife of Joseph. She was, according to a ratified engagement, dependent upon her husband's will.

¹ [As Calvin says (*in loc.*), 'Vocatur primogenitus; sed non alia ratione nisi ut sciamus, ex virgine esse natum.'—ED.]

² Lachmann has in Matt. the reading ἐτεκεν γιόν.

³ See Schaf, p. 83.

But it would be only upon the strongest testimony that we could admit that Mary became the mother of other children after the birth of Christ. No doctrinal grounds, in a narrower sense, prepossess us against this admission, but religio-philosophical and physical considerations, which indeed indirectly form themselves into doctrinal ones, inasmuch as all views must terminate in one christological view. As a wife, Mary was subject to wifely obligations; but, as a mother, she had fulfilled her destiny with the birth of Christ. The sacred organism of this woman, which had once contained the germ of the new humanity, which creative omnipotence had, by a stroke of heavenly influence, made to bring forth the manifestation of eternal life, was independent of the will of man and his fluctuations. And even for the very sake of nature's refinement, we cannot but imagine that this organism, which had borne the Prince of the new æon, would be too proudly or too sacredly disposed, to lend itself, after bringing forth the life of Christ, to the production of more common births for the sphere of the old æon.

A glance, too, into the Gospel history, will convince us that it is very improbable that Jesus had younger brothers and sisters. It is usual for a spirit like His to carry along with it the younger members of a family. From their first breath, they are under the influence of his superior force of character. If, then, Jesus had had brethren younger than Himself, we might expect that they would have surrendered themselves to Him with enthusiasm, and not have given Him anxiety as dissentients. We find, however, exactly the reverse. The brethren of Jesus seem, with relation to Him, to have early taken up the position of decided Jews. Their unbelief, mentioned by John (chap. vii. 3, 6), has indeed been too much smoothed over. That they intended to deride Him, is indeed not to be imagined. They were probably unbelieving in a similar sense to those Jews who wanted to make Him a king (John vi. 15), *i.e.*, without submission to His self-determination, without obedience. They could not reconcile themselves to his rule of life, but wanted Him to realize their Messianic notions. Nor would younger own brothers of Jesus, and children of Mary, have brought Mary herself into a dissentient position, and have ventured to give themselves the appearance of acting in concert with His mother, in their desire to restrain Him in His activity. But if we accept the view that these brethren were, some of them at least, older than Jesus, we cannot fail to remember that journey from the Passover in which His parents missed the child Jesus. For they lost Him through their assumption that He was among his kinsfolk and acquaintances (*ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς γνωστοῖς*, Luke ii. 44). Here relations are certainly spoken of as distinct from friends and acquaintances, and indeed from boy-relatives; since, as has been shown, we must suppose a separate train of boys. These boys must have been older than twelve, since those who were younger were left at home. Since, then, we certainly know of the existence of brethren of Jesus, and have found occasion to suppose that some of them were

older than He, we are obliged to conclude that they were either His half-brothers or cousins, for Mary had, in any case, no elder sons.

We now turn to the passage John xix. 25, to obtain information concerning the sister of Christ's mother. It is here said : There stood by the cross of Jesus, His mother, and His mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. According to the usual interpretation, three women are here named, while the sister of Jesus' mother is further designated the wife of Cleophas. On the other hand, however, Wieseler offers another interpretation.¹ He points out, first, that the sentence may easily be so construed as to speak of four women: Mary the mother of Jesus, her sister, whose name is not stated, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. He then supposes this unnamed sister to have been Salome, the mother of Zebedee's children. The arguments which he adduces in favour of this view, seem to us decisive. First, it is improbable that two sisters should both bear the name of Mary. Secondly, the statements of the two first Evangelists both lead to this view (Matt. xxvii. 56, comp. Mark xv. 40); Matthew saying that the mother of Zebedee's sons, and Mark that Salome was present at the crucifixion. John must at all events have been acquainted with this circumstance; and who could suppose that he would, in this passage, pass over his mother? But if he certainly has mentioned her, we can understand that he should maintain that same reserve of style with which he mentioned himself as the disciple whom Jesus loved. Thus also he designates his mother only in a periphrasis, by which he avoids pointing out his relation to her and mentioning her name. It is to this circumstance that we owe the information that Salome was a sister of Mary, and that consequently James and John, the sons of Zebedee, must be considered the cousins of Jesus. From this relationship Wieseler explains the circumstance, that these two brethren should unite with their mother in asking for the first places in the kingdom of Christ (Matt. xx. 20-28; Mark x. 35-45). Even Christ's legacy on the cross, by which he delivered the care of Mary to John, becomes, according to Wieseler's remark, still more comprehensible, when the relationship here pointed out is assumed.²

But perhaps it is of more importance, that this relationship confirms also the relationship of the family of Jesus to that of John the Baptist. It is among the Baptist's disciples that we first meet with the Apostle John. It is he who has preserved to us the most significant utterances of the Baptist concerning Jesus. As an intimate of John, he was present at his answer to the deputation sent to him from Jerusalem, and this circumstance might have been the means of his becoming acquainted with the family of the high priest. All

¹ Compare Wieseler's article, *Die Söhne Zebedäi, Vettern des Herrn*, in Ullmann and Umbreit's *Studien und Kritiken* for 1840, No. 3, p. 648.

² Finally, the author adduces, in favour of his hypothesis, the view of the Syrian Church. Hegesippus also, the oldest Church historian, who calls Cleophas a brother of Joseph, knew of the sisterly relationship between the wife of Cleophas and the mother of Jesus. For further proofs from apocryphal literature, see the above-named article, p. 681.

this does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the theologic and christologic John must have been related to the Baptist; but when we learn elsewhere that Salome was a sister of Mary, and Mary a relation of Elisabeth, we obtain a view of a connection between these three families which may explain much.

We can then no longer esteem the sons of Alpheus as cousins of Jesus, on the supposition that the wife^o of Cleophas was a sister of Mary. Thus much, however, may be with certainty affirmed from a consideration of the group of women at the foot of the cross, that Mary the wife of Cleophas was very nearly related to the Lord and to His mother. But Hegesippus informs us, after Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 11), that Cleophas was a brother of Joseph. We have no positive reasons for rejecting this ancient historical testimony. We have already seen that many theologians have founded upon this information the hypothesis that Joseph was own father to the children of this Mary the wife of Cleophas, by having occupied the place of his deceased brother. The objection to this view has already been stated.

We may then preliminarily consider these enigmatical brethren of Jesus as sons of Cleophas. They were merely His cousins (*ἀνεψιοι*), and not His brothers. Nay, they were no blood-relations at all, but cousins-in-law. How, then, did they come under the designation of brethren? In the simplest manner possible. Cleophas probably died while his children were still young. And this would cause Joseph, who was, we are informed, a just Israelite, to take in the widow and her children, and to adopt the latter. Since, however, Joseph died while Jesus was yet young, as many of these adopted brothers of Jesus, who might rightly be named His brethren, as were older than He, would properly become the heads of this Nazarene household. These young Jews might long maintain their own will against the younger brother, with whom they were only legally connected. As elder members of His family, they might even desire to have Him under their direction, though their Jewish pride might already have rejoiced in His fame. Finally, such a Jewish family spirit might have prevailed among them, that even Mary, a dependent woman, might have been so far led away, as, on one occasion, to join with them in desiring to arrest her Son's course. This took place during the second year of Christ's ministry. Jesus was already obliged to send His disciples to Jerusalem alone, having first definitely chosen and set apart twelve. He already numbered two of His brethren among them, though the circumstance that they are mentioned last in every catalogue of the apostles, shows that they were, at any rate, among the last who entered the company.¹ They might nevertheless have attempted to check His course, as Peter subsequently did, when Jesus was about to enter upon His sufferings. Christ's reproof of the untimely interference of His family by the words, 'Behold My mother and My brethren,' &c. (Mark iii. 34), must be compared with the saying with which

¹ James the Less seems to have received this surname, with reference to the earlier entrance of the other James among the band of disciples.

He rebuked Peter, 'Get thee behind Me, Satan' (Matt. xvi. 23), if we would recognize the identity of the two positions, and, at the same time, comprehend that the brethren of Jesus, though still, when viewed in the light of the subsequent pentecostal season, unbelieving, *i.e.*, self-willed and gloomy, could nevertheless be apostles. They were probably, in part at least, men of strong, firm natures.¹ Judas seems, in his unbending firmness, to have been the leading spirit of this Nazarene family, on which account, perhaps, the surname Lebbeus or Thaddeus, the courageous, the free-hearted, seems to have been given him.² The Epistle of Jude needs only to be read, to recognize such a character in every line. In the school of Jesus, respect was had to the real nobility of peculiar gifts, even though they often manifested themselves in peculiar errors; hence the sons of Zebedee were named the sons of thunder, Simon called Peter, while Jude received the characteristic name of Lebbeus or Thaddeus. It is therefore now clear to us, that the remark concerning the unbelief of the brethren of Jesus is not opposed to the fact of their being included among the apostles, as related by the Evangelist, especially when we reflect that this family spirit of opposition to the Messianic progress of Christ might have reached its climax in the persons of Joses and Simon. But before regarding our conclusions as established, we must glance at those passages in the apostolic epistles which have been thought opposed to them.

It seems from the Epistle to the Galatians (chap. i. 19, ii. 9 and 12), that a James was, together with Peter and John, held in the very highest esteem by the Church at Jerusalem, nay, that he represented, in a peculiar sense, the Jewish-Christian party. Now it has been supposed, that we may infer from the passages in question, that this James, as a brother of the Lord, is distinguished from the apostles. In conformity with this notion, some translate Gal. i. 19, 'I saw no other apostle than Peter, but yet I saw James.' This is, however, at all events, a forced view; a simpler one leads to the translation, 'other apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.'³ And the Epistle to the Galatians in general, when more strictly con-

¹ Comp. Winer's *R. W. B.*, Art. *Judas Lebbæus*.

² The expression, John vii. 4, is quite calculated to exhibit a character still biased by carnal courage, and inclined to see timidity in Christ's prudence. The same kind of expression, though ennobled, recurs John xiv. 21, here the decided utterance of this Judas.

³ [It has very commonly and carelessly been stated, that in the New Testament, *εἰ μὴ* uniformly preserves its exceptive use; and even with so accurate a grammarian as Elliecott, we find these words (*Hist. Lect.* p. 98, note): 'That Gal. i. 19 cannot be strained to mean, "I saw none of the apostles, *but* I saw the Lord's brother," seems almost certain from the regularly exceptive use which *εἰ μὴ* appears always to preserve in the New Testament.' But that *εἰ μὴ* does not always preserve its exceptive use, but is commonly used as an adversative, must appear unquestionable to any one who looks at Matt. xxiv. 36, Luke iv. 26 and 27, and Matt. v. 13; passages where the exceptive use of the expression is *simply impossible*. If an instance in classical Greek be desired, such will be found in Aristoph. *Eg.* 184. Mitchell, in his edition of that play (*in loc.*), remarks, 'In many cases, the French expression *au contraire* seems better to express its sense.' His further conjectures regarding the use of this formula are well worth considering. So far, then, as the use of *εἰ μὴ* goes the controverted passage is susceptible of either rendering.—ED.]

sidered, offers evidence that this James could be no other than the Apostle James, the son of Alpheus. In its second chapter, the Apostle Paul designates him as one of the three apostolic men who were regarded as pillars of the Church. He appears to have been that apostolic individual upon whom the opponents of St Paul most relied. These opponents denied the apostolical authority of St Paul. They reproached him with having no historical mission (Gal. i. 1), with not being appointed by Christ Himself, as the other apostles had been. They thus opposed his ecclesiastical legitimacy. Now it is in the highest degree improbable, that these early zealots for the succession theory should have opposed to St Paul the name of one who, in the sense in which they rejected Paul, was himself no legitimate apostle.¹ The spirit of the Church at Jerusalem had not indeed become so carnal as to number one who was not an apostle among the apostles, merely on account of his brotherhood with Christ. In this case, Joses would also have been an apostle. But if James were an apostle, besides being a brother of the Lord, this latter fact would much enhance his credit, and the Jewish party might lay an emphasis on this appellation with a view of depressing the credit of Paul.

On careful consideration, then, of the inner meaning of this contrast, we cannot but esteem the James of the Jewish party to have been the Apostle James. The book of the Acts, too, leads to the same conclusion. In the list of the apostles, Acts i. 13, we find the two well-known apostles of this name. The twelfth chapter relates the martyrdom of James the Great. Subsequently we find but one James spoken of (chap. xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18). Now it is quite natural, that after one James had been removed from the scene, the designation, the son of Alpheus, should be omitted after the name of the other. But if a brother of the Lord had gradually attained great consideration, it is in the highest degree improbable that he should have meanwhile become an apostle, and still more so, that as an apostle he should have eclipsed this James, the son of Alpheus (whom we besides already know as the Lord's brother). But it would be utterly impossible that his name should forthwith have become so exclusively renowned, that it should have no longer been found necessary to distinguish him from James the son of Alpheus, if the latter were distinct from him.

When, finally, we consider the two epistles which have been attributed to the brethren of the Lord, we find no fresh grounds for the view which distinguishes these relatives of Jesus from the apostles. It has been remarked, that James, in his epistle, does not call himself an apostle, but a servant of God and of Jesus Christ. In answer to this, it is replied, that St John also does not call himself an apostle in his epistle. Probably the choice of the

¹ Compare Wieseler on the brethren of the Lord in Ullmann and Umbreit's *Studien und Kritiken*, 1842, No. i. p. 84. 'The same Jewish Christians who denied the apostolic dignity of Paul, on account of his supposed deficiency in this respect when compared with the other apostles, although it was recognized by the latter, would then have placed James above the other apostles, in spite of the very same deficiency.'

words, a servant of Jesus Christ, may have been caused, in the cases of both James and Jude, by a feeling of humility, which impelled them thus strongly to express their spiritual dependence upon Christ, in contrast with that honourable title which they bore in the Church. The author of the Epistle of Jude ingeniously styles himself the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James. He seems to desire indirectly to designate himself as the brother of Jesus, though his heart impels him first to announce his dependence upon Him. The expression ‘of the holy apostles,’ ver. 17, cannot possibly be looked upon as excluding him from the apostles; for he is speaking of the apostles only in a very limited manner, viz., so far as they had beforehand announced to the Church that in the last days there should be dangerous mockers. All the apostles, as such, can hardly be spoken of here; and least of all can they be mentioned in contrast to Jude. That the whole epistle entirely corresponds with the character of Lebbeus or Thaddeus, has already been mentioned.¹ Jesus, then, grew up in a remarkable household, which had been fashioned by the storms of life, by want, and by love. Two sisters-in-law of similar names were the matrons of the circle. The children of Cleophas, with whom Jesus lived as brothers and sisters, seem to have manifested the same upright, sensible, and decided kind of character which distinguished Joseph, but to have had but little mental riches or profundity. They were no blood-relations of Jesus. Without imputing direct blame to these relatives, or in any way impugning their sincerity and worth, we may say that the sorrows which the mother of Jesus and her Son may have experienced in such a circle, are written in their secret history. This connection was a sad, yet blessed necessity. Jesus, however, in His dying hour, felt it most suited to his mother’s feelings to give her John for a son. Paul was on the most friendly terms with the Lord’s brother, though his disposition formed the greatest contrast to his own.² It was the advice of this James which brought about the catastrophe of his life. It was not without deliberation that the early Church received into the canon the epistles of the Lord’s brethren; and even Luther ventured upon a severe condemnation of the Epistle of James. It was certainly

¹ The passage 1 Cor. ix. 5, only strengthens our view. When it is said, Have we not power to take with us a sister, as a wife, as the other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?—the brethren of the Lord evidently mark the first, and Cephas the second, degrees of an ascending series. But the brethren of the Lord could only form a gradation if they were also apostles. Peter, again, forms a gradation above them, as being both an apostle and the founder of the first church. If, then, the brethren of the Lord appear here as apostles, placed between Peter and the other apostles, it is evident that more than one are spoken of, as uniting these two qualifications; and therefore not only James, but also Jude. We should then here be obliged to place not merely James, but also Jude, as brethren of the Lord who were not apostles, above the apostles, unless we take the passage in its plain and simple sense. In the passage 1 Cor. xv. 5–7, the sentences: Christ appeared to Cephas—εἴτε τοῖς δώδεκα: to James—εἴτε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, are entirely parallel. If in the latter case James is to be distinguished from the apostles, Cephas must equally be distinguished from the Twelve.

² Comp. the concluding words of the above-named work of Schaf, pp. 90 ff.

from no family partiality that Jesus made these temperate but sincere characters, James and Jude, pillars of His Church. He used them as instruments of spreading His Gospel, for those who were zealous for the law, not only in Israel, but in all the world; well knowing, that there were numbers who could only be reached by such instrumentality. But their special vocation was to watch against all dissoluteness and antinomianism; and these errors they opposed like heroes, Jude attacking the former, and James the latter.

According to Mark vi. 3,¹ the Nazarenes called Jesus Himself 'the carpenter.' In Matthew the term is exchanged for 'the carpenter's son' (xiii. 53). The tradition of the early Church, however, agrees with Mark in the belief that Jesus, in His youth, practised the trade of His father. Apocryphal writings describe Him as fashioning all kinds of wooden vessels.² Justin Martyr relates, that Jesus made ploughs and yokes, thereby exhibiting symbols of righteousness, and inculcating an active life.³ This tradition, however, cannot be regarded as an historical certainty. But neither, on the other hand, can we raise any objection to the view, that Jesus should have laboured as an artizan. It has been remarked, that among the Jews no idea of degradation was attached to handicraft; even Paul practised a trade. Such an observation may facilitate our conception of the youthful activity of Jesus. But it must not be forgotten, that even a mind like that of Jacob Böhm the cobbler could, though in an aristocratic age, number noblemen among his pupils. If Christ really worked as a mechanic, He ennobled labour; that He who ennobled even the death of the innocent upon the accursed tree should be degraded by such a circumstance, can be a cause of anxiety only to the weakest minds. We may indeed suppose that it was in an ideal state of mind that He fashioned His vessels of wood, and that yokes and ploughs would become symbols in His hands. The sons of Alpheus, however, who with Jewish pride saw in Him the glory of Israel, who was to be manifested to the world (John vii. 4, xiv. 22), would hardly have suffered Him to work much. It may also have frequently occurred, that during His journeys to the festivals He passed some time in a circle of chosen ones, or that days and nights spent upon the mountain solitudes of Galilee in profound contemplation and fervent prayer, flew by as but an instant, in communion with God, to whom a thousand years are as one day. The forty days' sojourn in the wilderness, which represents one single meditation or act of devotion, leads to the conclusion that He had before been frequently in a similar state of unconsciousness of the lapse of time.⁴ Thus, even in His youth, He was accustomed to the

¹ Origen, in opposing Celsus, states that in the Gospels which were spread in the Church, Jesus was Himself called *τέκτων*. See Lachmann, *Nov. Test.*, Mark vi. 3.

² Comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 322.

³ *Dialog. c. Tryph.* 88. Neander and others seem to find three kinds of vessels mentioned in the passage in question—ploughs, yokes, and scales.

⁴ In the life of Socrates we meet with an instance of this intensity of contemplation. He stands for a surprisingly long time on one spot, lost in reflection upon a problem.

solemn loneliness of night, to the solitary ways of the Spirit amid desert solitudes, in which the heart is so susceptible of the secret influences of the all-present and living God. In the freedom of this course of life, which we claim for the Lord's youthful years, and which Mary and her foster-family would themselves undoubtedly claim for Him, His bodily activity could not have been very great. His self-consciousness was strong enough to let Him allow Himself to be cared for in temporal things, by those who became through Him acquainted with a blessedness of which, but for Him, they could have formed no conception.

If we now finally inquire into the extent of Christ's worldly means, and consider Him, at one time, as quite poor, because His parents brought the offering of the poor in the temple, or because He had not where to lay His head; at another, as in prosperity, perhaps because He wore a seamless coat, or for similar reasons; we should, above all things, well consider that the glaring difference between poor and rich which prevailed in the old æon had no signification for Him. He knew neither the cares nor the desires which make the poor wretched; in communion with God, and in the abundance of His love, He was the richest of kings. And though He had possessed the richest of inheritances, He would still have been among the poorest, since He could have kept nothing for Himself. In communion with His Father, and His spiritual family whom He met with everywhere, He never felt want. But the riches in presence of which all want disappears, are a mysterious possession, a Messianic treasury, not to be estimated according to rates of worldly property.

NOTES.

1. Our view of the family of Jesus is as follows:—

(1.) Cleophas was (according to Hegesippus) the brother of Joseph.

(2.) Mary was his wife, and therefore sister-in-law to the mother of Jesus (John xix. 25).

(3.) This Mary was (according to Mark xv. 40; comp. John xix. 25) the mother of James the Less, and of Joses.

(4.) This James, called the Less to distinguish him from James the Great in the apostolic catalogue, must therefore be identical with James the son of Alpheus.

(5.) James the Less survived his parents as an apostle. When the Epistle of Jude was written, the other James was already dead. The author of the Epistle of Jude calls himself the brother of James. This designation makes it probable that he was the same Jude whom Luke calls, in the apostolic catalogue (vi. 16), Jude of James.

Thus these apostolic men, James, Joses, and Jude, appear to have been brothers, sons of Alpheus, and in a civil sense, cousins of our Lord.

(6.) According to Matthew xiii. 55, the brothers of Jesus are

called James, Joses, Simon, and Judas. His sisters are only mentioned, and not named. In Mark vi. 3, the order is James, Joses, Judas, and Simon ; the first three names coinciding with those of the three sons of Alpheus.

(7.) According to Hegesippus and Eusebius, Simeon, a son of Cleophas, suffered martyrdom under Trajan, as Bishop of Jerusalem. Consequently, the fourth among the brethren of Jesus is also found among the sons of Alpheus, and there can be no doubt that the sons of Alpheus were the brethren of Jesus.

(8.) They were, in a legal sense, not merely cousins, but brothers, if Joseph had adopted them as the orphan-children of his deceased brother. That such adoptions were not uncommon, is proved by the circumstance that Christ enjoined one even on the cross.

2. By the brethren of Jesus, mentioned Acts i. 14, as distinct from the apostles, may be understood Joses and Simon.

3. The assumption that the names of Alpheus and Cleophas are identical, is claimed by Schaf in the corrections at the conclusion of the above-named brochure. He remarks first, that it is striking that it should be John (xix. 25) who uses the Aramaean, and Matthew and Mark (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18) the Greek form. This difference may be easily explained. The expression, Mary of Cleophas, belonged to the Hebrew family tradition of the apostles ; they seldom used it, and had no need to give it a Greek form. It was otherwise with the expression, James of Alpheus. The name James was one which the apostles were everywhere repeating within the sphere of the Church, and which they could not therefore but translate into its general language. The same circumstance explains the author's second scruple, that Luke has both forms ; for, on one occasion, he gives the name according to the form in which it would naturally appear in the græcized apostolic catalogue (vi. 15), on the other, he is relating an occurrence, to whose vivid representation it was more appropriate that the name of Cleophas, who is introduced as a speaker, should not be exchanged for Alpheus.¹

¹ [Both here and in Germany opinion is still very much divided regarding the brethren of our Lord. Equally competent investigators have ranged themselves on opposite sides, and men who elsewhere agree, here differ. Besides the Bible Dictionaries, we may refer to Greswell's *Dissertations on the Harmony* (Diss. xvii.) for a defence of the opinion that our Lord's brethren were the children of Joseph and Mary ; and for a very full and able advocacy of the other opinion, to Mill's *Myth. Interpretation*, pp. 219–274. A very impartial statement of the question is given by Riggensbach (*Vorlesungen über das Leben Jesu*, p. 286, &c.). The following words of Andrews (*Life of our Lord*, p. 107) deserve to be quoted : ‘It is evident from this brief survey of the chief opinions respecting the Lord’s brethren and their relations to Jesus, that the data for a very positive judgment are wanting. There can be no doubt that the very general, although not universal, opinion in the Church, has been in favour of the perpetual virginity of Mary. In regard to the Lord’s brethren, there were some in very early times who thought them the children of Joseph and Mary, but most thought them to be either his cousins, or the children of Joseph. It is difficult to tell which of the latter two opinions is the elder, or best supported by tradition. The words of Calvin on Matt. i. 25 deserve to be kept in mind : Certe nemo unquam hac de re quæstionem movebit nisi curiosus ; nemo vero pertinaciter insistet nisi contentiousus rixator.’—ED.]

PART III.

THE ANNOUNCEMENT AND CHARACTER OF CHRIST'S PUBLIC MINISTRY.

SECTION I.

DETERMINATION OF THE DATES.

ACCORDING to the statements of the Evangelist Luke, which appear to us well accredited, John was about half a year older than Jesus. To this difference in their ages, the difference in the time of their first public appearance most exactly corresponds. John had only for a short period entered on the exercise of his vocation, when Jesus arrived at the Jordan to prepare Himself by baptism for assuming His official functions.

It was not to be expected that these two champions of Heaven (*Gotteshelden*) would begin their ministry before the completion of their thirtieth year. Reverence for their national institutions would deter them from committing such a violation of law and custom, which required that mature age for entering on any public office.¹ But as little could it be supposed that they would delay beyond this highest point of their manly development, past the limits assigned by the law, to enter upon their divine mission. As, on the one hand, they were kept back by the law up to a certain age, and on the other, impelled by the power of the Spirit to lose no time when they had reached that limit, we may believe that they would carefully observe the exact time of entering on their office; just as the racer starts for the goal at the given signal, or a volley

¹ See Num. iv. 3, 37, viii. 24; 1 Chron. xxiii. 24; 2 Chron. xxxi. 17. In these passages a scale is noticeable from 20 years old to 25, and again to 30. It has been questioned, whether from the legal standard fixed for the Levites in reference to the commencement and term of their service, any conclusion can be drawn relative to the more irregular ministry of the prophets. Here a distinction must be made between prophetic acts and prophetic authority. Prophetic declarations could emanate in Israel from any individual, even from children and women; but prophetic authority would hardly be granted to one who was levitically a minor, especially if he was commissioned to rebuke the priests. Besides, John the Baptist was in this respect, as a Levite, subject to the Levitical arrangements. But Christ was not only the supreme Prophet, but also the real High Priest, and would avoid most scrupulously every ground of offence which would make His office of questionable validity to the Israelites. But this legal point was in His case connected with the inner motive, namely, to await the completion of His consciousness.

is fired at the exact moment. John might perhaps, during the winter season, delay the administration of baptism, but not the commencement of his ministry.¹

Matthew does not state the exact time of John's first public appearance. 'In those days,' he says, 'came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea' (iii. 1). He does not mean those days in which Jesus first took up His abode at Nazareth, but that later period in which, by having resided there, He was regarded as belonging to that city (ii. 23). Thus much we gather from this statement, that when the Baptist made his first appearance, Jesus was still residing at Nazareth. Luke informs us still more precisely that 'in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness; and he came into all the country round about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins' (iii. 1-3).

Luke seems to distinguish the early prophetic ministry of John in the wilderness, from his coming forward at the Jordan as the Baptist.² Even Matthew has in his eye a period of certain days, during which the preaching of John served as a preparation for the rite of baptism which he afterwards performed at the Jordan.³ Mark joins the two points of time in one; for the preaching of John was from the first an announcement that the people were to submit to a baptism of repentance; and John, as to his manner of life and position, was always in the wilderness; the region he occupied as the sphere of the preacher in the wilderness, formed a decided contrast to the region of the temple. Moreover, the wilderness of Judea, which lies between Kedron and the Dead Sea, and in which John first appeared as a preacher of repentance, is in the direction of the wilderness near Jericho, through which the Israelites travelled from Jerusalem to the Jordan, and not far from it.⁴ To the inhabitants of Jerusalem the two wildernesses might more easily seem to run into one another, because John probably had his proper residence still in the wilderness, even when he administered baptism. At all events, the greater number of the persons he baptized had to go through the wilderness in order to reach him. But a large district is always distinguished by its predominant character, and especially by the strong impression it makes by means of some one striking

¹ Though we might give the Theocrat credit that for himself he would not hesitate to bathe in the Jordan when swelled by the wintry snow-water of Hermon, since as a Nazarite he had grown up in the desert in the full heroic energy of a life of nature, yet the multitude would hardly be induced to submit to baptism at that time of the year, the rainy season. See Wieseler, *Chronol. Synops.*, p. 148.

² See Neander, Life of Jesus Christ (Bohn's Tr.), p. 50.

³ See chap. iii. 1-5.

⁴ [A description of the scene of John's baptism is given in Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 310.—ED.]

figure. And thus John was everywhere the Baptist in the wilderness, both in a symbolical and a literal sense.¹

Now if John, as we must suppose from comparing his age with that of Jesus, was thirty years old in the autumn of the year 779, he probably began to preach about that time. Meanwhile the winter set in, and he could not enter on the administration of baptism before the mild spring-weather of 780; by that time a movement had commenced among the people, and the season suitable for their great lustration had arrived. Jesus also, having about this time completed His thirtieth year, presented Himself for baptism. After His baptism He passed forty days in the wilderness; subsequently, He spent short portions of time at Cana, Nazareth, and Capernaum, probably occupied in the first quiet beginnings of His ministry. Then came the spring of the year 781; and now He went up to the Passover at Jerusalem for the first time in the capacity of a prophet, discharged His office in the midst of the people, and effected the purification of the temple.

Two years before the death of Augustus, about the year 765, Tiberius was raised to share the imperial throne;² but in the year 767 Augustus died. As John probably appeared as the Baptist at the Jordan in the summer of 780, after introducing the rite in the autumn and winter of 779, we must suppose that Luke has included in his reckoning the previous regency of Tiberius. On this supposition, the year 779 would be the fifteenth year of Tiberius.³

As great numbers had been baptized before Christ presented Himself at the Jordan, we may presume that He was not baptized till late in the summer of 780. But when He purified the temple at the Passover, in 781, the Jews asked Him by what sign He could accredit that act. On His answering, ‘Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up,’ they rejoined, ‘Forty-six years

¹ But how, the critic asks, can it be said that Jesus went from the wilderness (where John was), into the wilderness (where He Himself was tempted)? This supposed contradiction is nothing but an illusion to which inaccurate persons are liable from the very accuracy of the designations in the Gospel. He who resides only a few hours' distance from the Rhine says, I am going to the Rhine, though he settles only in a place in the vicinity of the Rhine. From that position, he then goes, when he will, still again to the Rhine. So that one may go from the wilderness into the wilderness,—a marvellous thing, unless the critic has some skill in perspective.

² See Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 172; Tacit. *Annal.* i. 3; Sueton. *Tiber.* 20, 21.—Küinoel, *Commentar. in Ev. Luc.* edit. ii. p. 343. Lucas ad desigandum Tiberii principatum non adhibuit vocabulum *μοναρχία* aut *βασιλεία* sed nomen *ἡγεμονία*, quod de quovis imperio, de quavis dignitate ac potestate usurpari solet, &c. Nulla idonea proferri potest ratio, cur non lieuerit Lucæ initium principatus imperii ab eo tempore derivare, quo factus esset Augusti collega, quum imprimis in provinciis, qualis Judea fuit, pari dignitate haberetur, atque Augustus. Non improbatum est, Lucam secutum esse morem Scripturæ. In historia enim regum et in Jereinia anni Nabuchodonosoris reges Babyloniae ab eo tempore numerantur, quo pater filium in societatem imperii recepit.

³ Wieseler advocates the view, that Luke (iii. 1) speaks not of John's first appearance, but of a second stage of it, involving a course of action which led to his imprisonment. The mention of the fact, that Herod had ‘shut up John in prison’ (ver. 20), is in favour of it. But, on the other hand, in the same connection the appearance of Christ is represented as future (ver. 16), which it could only have been previous to Christ's public ministry. That Luke should incidentally mention, by anticipation, John's imprisonment, occasions no difficulty.

was this temple in building, and wilt Thou rear it up in three days?' The building of Herod's temple was still in progress, though it was begun before the Passover of 735, and as 46 years had passed since that time, the conversation of Christ with the Jews occurred in the year 781.¹

The ministry of John, who probably changed his first station on the banks of the Jordan for one higher up, lasted most likely to the winter of the year 781. While he was baptizing in Galilee, Christ was occupied in Judea. At the time of John's imprisonment in Galilee, the supreme council at Jerusalem began to watch the rising reputation of Jesus with an unfriendly eye, in consequence of which He left Judea and retired into Galilee.²

In the spring of the next year, 782, John was still in prison, and it was then he sent the well-known deputation to Christ, which, according to Matt. xi. 1, 2, appears to have been at the close of the first journeying of Christ through Galilee, and therefore before His visit to the feast of Purim, narrated by the Evangelist John. The beheading of John took place not long after, probably between the feast of Purim and the Passover of 782.³ Christ did not publicly attend the Passover of this year, but the following one, in 783. The first feast-day of this year, which began with eating the Passover the preceding night, was a Friday.⁴

In addition to the chronological datum by which Luke fixes the time of John's ministry, he has given other historical indications,⁵

¹ See Wieseler, p. 166. [Lichtenstein, however, who is a worthy rival of Wieseler in chronological investigations, shows (p. 75, *Lebensgeschichte des Herrn Jesu Christi in chronologischer Uebersicht*, Erlangen, 1856) that the 46th year is 780; and (p. 153) makes it appear probable that Jesus was baptized towards the end of December 779 or beginning of January 780. So also Andrews, *Life of our Lord upon the Earth* in its Chronol. Relations, Lond, 1863. Tischendorf (*Synops. Evang. xix.*) prefers the close of 780.—ED.]

² According to John iv. 1, Jesus probably returned to Galilee towards the end of autumn in 781, because the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, and because an extraordinary excitement of popular feeling on His behalf in Judea had begun to make Him an object of hostile observation to the Pharisees. We must consider this return of Jesus to Galilee as identical with that mentioned in the synoptic Gospels (Matt. iv. 12; Mark i. 14; Luke iv. 14). When the synoptic Gospels allege as a motive for His return, that Jesus had heard of John's imprisonment, this motive is not sufficient by itself to explain His conduct, since it was by the tetrarch of Galilee that John had been put in confinement. But that event reacted on the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. The Pharisees might be stirred up to apprehend the second prophet, since Herod had apprehended the first, and since John, whom with his voice of thunder they feared more than Jesus, could no longer protect the latter by his high repute. The reference of the passage in Luke iv. 43, 44, to one and the same event, is also in favour of this opinion. The passage in John iv. 1 does not imply, as Wieseler thinks, that the Baptist was at that time still exercising his ministry. The comparison of the ministry of Jesus with that of John does not involve that they were contemporaneous.

³ Compare Matt. xiv. 10, 20 with John vi. 1-14. On the locality from which Herod Antipas issued his orders for the execution of the prisoner in the castle of Machærus, see Wieseler, p. 250: it was Julias or Livias, in that region of Peræa, situated not far from Machærus.

⁴ See Wieseler, p. 176.

⁵ [On the significance of these as indications of the political condition of the Jews, see some acute remarks by Lichtenstein, *Lebensgeschichte*, &c. Ann. 11 and 12.—ED.]

which are contained in the passage quoted above. Of these the first is, that Pontius Pilate was then governor of Judea: he filled that office ten years,—namely, from the end of 778 or the beginning of 779 to the year 789.

In Luke's description, Herod appears as tetrarch of Galilee. This was the Herod Antipas who beheaded John the Baptist. He held this dignity from the death of his father, Herod the Great, till some years after the death of Christ, but lost it in the year 792. In the third place, Philip is named as being then tetrarch of Ituræa and Trachonitis. He reigned from the death of Herod, at the time of the return of the Holy Family from Egypt, to the year 786. Though all these specifications agree with the history of the times as gathered from other sources, yet some critics believe they have detected a great error in the account of the fourth of the Syrian princes, namely, that Lysanias was tetrarch of Abilene. From Josephus (*Antiq.* xv. 4, § 1) and Dio Cassius (xlix. 32) we learn that, sixty years before the time in which the Lysanias of Luke must have lived, a Lysanias of Abilene was assassinated, and that Cleopatra obtained a part of his dominions; while Josephus says nothing of a Lysanias who reigned about the time of Christ. In this case, according to the demands of a noted critic, the silence of the Jewish historian is to be held decisive against the testimony of the Christian; the inference follows directly, that the latter made an error of sixty years in his account, or held the current designation of that province as the Abilene of Lysanias to be a sufficient ground for assuming that Abilene was then governed by a Lysanias.¹ Those who regard the statement, as it stands, as incorrect, and yet think they can escape the consequence that Luke was mistaken, effect their object by reading the passage modified in one way or another. Dr Paulus thinks that the passage is to be read in connection with the preceding clause, thus: 'At that time Philip was tetrarch over Ituræa and Trachonitis, and over the Abilene of the tetrarch Lysanias.' This translation is obtained either by omitting *τετραρχοῦντος* after Abilene (with Codex L.); or by reading *καὶ τῆς Λυσανιοῦ Ἀβιληνῆς τετραρχοῦντος*, and construing *τετραρχοῦντος* with *Φιλίππου*; or, lastly, by a forced interpretation translating the text as it stands, in the manner specified. But not only the arbitrary liberty taken with the text and its obvious meaning tells against such an expedient, but likewise the circumstance that it is not only destitute of proof, but is in the highest degree improbable, that Philip, besides his own territory, should have obtained Abilene from the Roman power.² It is therefore much simpler to leave the district of Abilene to Lysanias, though we know nothing further about him, than to make it over to Philip, to whom the history does not assign it—indeed, from whose tetrarchy it plainly distinguishes that of Lysanias.³ Moreover, positive considerations

¹ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, p. 343.

² Josephus, *Antiq.* xvii. 11, § 4; *De Bello Jud.* ii. 6, § 3. Compare Wieseler, *Chron. Synops.* p. 177.

³ See the passage from Josephus in Wieseler, p. 177.

present themselves, as Wieseler in his often quoted work has shown,¹ which justify Luke's statement.² First of all, it is worthy of notice that, according to Josephus (*Antiq.* xv. 6, § 4), Cleopatra obtained only a part of the possessions of Lysanias. Wieseler infers, that most probably the remainder was left to the heirs of Lysanias, from the circumstance that at a later period one Zenodorus appears as farming the inheritance of Lysanias (*Antiq.* xv. 10, § 1). Wieseler concludes that he probably entered into this engagement because the heirs of Lysanias, being minors, were under guardianship. Then, lastly, the territory of Lysanias is mentioned by Josephus as a tetrarchy, which in the year 790 was given with the tetrarchy of Philip, by the Emperor Caius Caligula, to Agrippa. From these several indications the critic just named concludes, that between the years 734-790 there must have been a younger Lysanias who governed Abilene as a tetrarch.³ As the earlier Lysanias is not designated a tetrarch, the fact is of importance, that Pococke describes a coin which names on its superscription a tetrarch Lysanias; and the same traveller discovered an inscription in a temple on the summit of the ancient Abila, 15 English miles from Damascus, which also speaks of the tetrarch Lysanias of Abilene. But the notices in Josephus already mentioned are quite sufficient to introduce the historic testimony of Luke.

To the preceding chronological data Luke adds the striking statement, that 'Annas was high priest, and Caiaphas.' It has been supposed that Annas is placed first because he was the Nasi or president of the Sanhedrim, while Caiaphas was the officiating high priest in the matter of sacrifices.⁴ But Caiaphas (according to John xviii.) evidently appears as the proper judge of Jesus; but he was His judge, not as high priest, but as president of the Sanhedrim.⁵ Moreover, the Romans, who had less to do with the sacrificing priest than with the presidency of the Sanhedrim, would have thought it of no consequence to remove Annas from the high-priesthood, if that measure had not, in fact, mainly dealt with the presidency of the supreme civil tribunal. Luke seems to mark that degradation of the high-priesthood ironically, when he speaks of a high priest (*ἀρχιεπεψ*) Annas, and Caiaphas; the one, that is to say, had the influence, the other the office. In like manner Annas appears in John (xviii. 4): not as president of the council, but as father-in-law of Caiaphas, he had the honour of having Jesus first sent to him. Caiaphas is the high priest 'that same year.' At a period when the office of high priest changed hands so often, he figured as the high priest of the year; but in the national feeling the real, permanent high priest was Annas. It was Caiaphas who

¹ With a reference to the treatise by Hug, *Gutachten über das Leben Jesu*, critically examined by Dr David Strauss. *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, Bd. i. Heft 2.

² *Chronol. Synops.* 179.

³ [Robinson comes to the same conclusion on similar grounds—*Biblical Researches in Palestine*, iii. 482-4; and compare Ebrard's *Gospel History* (Clark, 1863), p. 143.—ED.]

⁴ See Wieseler, *Chronol. Synops.* p. 183.

⁵ [Lichtenstein supposes he may have been vice-president.—ED.]

uttered the official adage, that ‘it was expedient one man should die for the people’—an inconsiderate expression, which evinced neither great political wisdom nor a noble disposition, but which in a higher sense might be regarded as an unconscious prophecy of the atonement.¹

According to the before-named chronological limits of the ministry of John the Baptist, he was probably engaged in it for half a year before he had fully aroused the people and called them to baptism. After that, he was about a year and a half occupied in baptizing them. Finally, his imprisonment appears to have lasted about half a year. A doubt has been expressed, whether it was possible for John, in the short space of time allowed him by the Evangelists, to make so great an impression on his nation. But if we bear in mind that the infinitely superior ministry of Christ was comprised in the space of two years and a half, we shall find it very conceivable that two years sufficed John for his vocation. Indeed, John must already in the first half-year have agitated his nation, in order to appear as the Baptist. But would it require more than half a year to set Israel in motion when the message resounded, ‘The kingdom of the Messiah is at hand! Come, purify yourselves, in order to enter it!’ The history of the false messiahs shows that the people were easily set in motion by an announcement of the Messiah’s advent. But, apart from the wonderful effect of this message on the theocratic nation, we need only look back on the middle ages, or into the history of Methodism, to be convinced how speedily a great preacher of repentance, simply as such, can agitate the popular mind. We may here be reminded how the theses of Luther spread like wildfire.

En peu d'heure, Dieu labeure, is a French proverb expressive of the agency of God generally. But this will apply with peculiar force to the agency of God in critical periods of the world’s history.² We must regard those minds as ill endowed who have no perception that God in His kingdom often works by voices, thunder, and lightnings (Rev. viii. 5). But in reference to John, we might wonder that the widely extended ministry of such a man left behind so slight an effect, if we did not also recollect that the splendour of his career was lost in that of Jesus, as the morning star before the sun; while in the school of ‘John’s disciples’ only the long shadow of

¹ It appears from John xviii. 24, that there was no change of place, no sending from palace to palace. The temple guards follow the Jewish national instinct: they lead Jesus first before him who was really the high priest in the opinion of the Jews. He submits Jesus to a preliminary examination, and then sends Him bound to be disposed of by Caiaphas, who was the officiating, titular high priest—the official high priest in the opinion of the Romans, who by their arbitrary appointments converted the high-priesthood into an annual office. The ἀπέστελεν αὐτὸν δεδεμένον (ver. 24) may be explained according to the analogy of the passage Luke iv. 19, ἀποστεῖλατ εὐ ἀφέσει. Annas, as the proper deciding hierarch, sent the Lord bound to Caiaphas; by that His fate was already decided.

² [‘Usefulness and power are not measured by length of life. . . . Youth has originated all the great movements of the world.’—Young’s *Christ of History*, p. 31.—ED.]

the expiring remains of its Jewish restrictedness has been thrown across the world's history.

John described himself as ‘the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord.’ He exerted an influence suited to his gifts and destiny, which were intended to arouse and prepare, not to fulfil and satisfy. ‘He was a burning and a shining light,’ according to the words of Christ. Does such a fiery signal at the outset of a great history require much time? Certainly much time, says the critic.¹ Does the sharp note of an overture, where-with one stroke announces the character of the piece and prepares the audience for it, require much time? Surely, thinks the questioner, the instruments take a long time before they are in perfect tune. The world's history pronounces otherwise, and herein agrees with art. It is the office of a historical period to tune the instruments for a new epoch; but when this opens, new operations succeed, stroke upon stroke, like lightning and thunder. Clement of Alexandria calls the Baptist the voice or sound of the Logos. This expression is ingenious; though we must remark that the Logos has His own peculiar sound, and John his own special mode of thought (*sein eigenthümlich Logisches*) proceeding from the life of the Logos. If we adhere to Clement's figurative language, we may say that John is to be regarded as a clear trumpet-tone in which the Israelitish feeling for the Messiah expressed itself, and His forthcoming manifestation was announced; or as the clear response which the sound of the incarnate Eternal Word, in His New Testament fulness, called forth in the last and noblest prophet of the Old Testament dispensation.

NOTES.

1. Abilene, the territory belonging to the town of Abila, was a district of Anti-Lebanon towards the east of Hermon; it sloped from Anti-Lebanon towards the plain of Damascus.

2. It is as little possible to learn the special tendency of the Baptist from the tendency of the later sect called ‘John's Disciples,’ as to form a judgment of a believer who is awakened to a new life from the workings of his old sinful nature in his subsequent history. The so-called John's disciples, who formed themselves into a sect hostile to Christianity, represent John's old Adam; they form the great historical shadow of the great Prophet—the cast-off slough of a religious genius, thrown off when he put on Christ, and whose violent death in Galilee prefigured the violent death of Christ in Jerusalem.

SECTION II.

JOHN THE BAPTIST.

John the Baptist, in his manifestation and agency, was like a burning torch; his public life was quite an earthquake—the whole

¹ See Weisse, *die evang. Geschichte*, i. 253.

man was a sermon ; he might well call himself a voice—‘the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord’ (John i. 23).

But if we attempt to seize the characteristic features of this great phenomenon, we shall be able plainly to distinguish the Nazarite, the prophet, and the religious reformer in a more confined sense, although these characteristics are combined in him in a most living expressive unity.

He ‘grew and waxed strong’ in the virgin solitudes of nature (Luke i. 80). In his excursions from the hill-country of Judea, he had become acquainted with the sacred loneliness of the adjacent desert region,¹ and here the Spirit of the Lord had spoken to his spirit.² In chosen privation as a free son of the wilderness, he had accustomed himself to the simplest diet ; locusts and wild honey sufficed him. He clothed himself in raiment of camel’s hair, with a leathern girdle about his loins.³ Thus the Nazarite assumed the form of the preacher of repentance. But he also knew the significance of his Nazarite vow ; he knew that he had to lead back Israel from the illusions of their formalized temple-worship into the wilderness, from which they had at first emerged as the people of the law, that they might purify themselves in the wilderness for the new economy of the kingdom of God. The Nazarite is a preacher of repentance in the deeply earnest tone of his soul, and therefore in the pensive seriousness of his appearance.

It does not, however, in the least follow from this devoted man’s mode of life that he wished to convert others into ascetics like himself.⁴ He was perfectly aware of the singularity of his position, and knew how, with noble freedom, to appreciate other modes of life, and especially higher spiritual stages. But that the persons who became his disciples must have accommodated themselves to his peculiar habits, lies in the very nature of such a connection. They were his assistants in administering baptism, and must therefore have complied with the pre-requisites of this employment—of this symbolic preaching of repentance.⁵

But the divine commission which constituted him a prophet was the revelation that the kingdom of God was at hand for His people ; that therefore the Messiah, as the founder of this kingdom, was forthcoming, and that he was destined to prepare the way for Him. The Spirit of God had also assured him, that by a divine sign the individual would be manifested to him whom he would have to point out as the Lord and Founder of this kingdom. He had become familiar with the idea and presentiment of this destination

¹ See Robinson’s Researches [and Andrews, p. 128].

² We are here reminded of Fox, the founder of the sect of the Quakers, and of other distinguished characters of world-wide reputation.

³ See Von Ammon, *die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, i. 251. [Kitto, Daily Bible Illust., 32d Week, 3d Day.]

⁴ When Strauss imagines that John, as ‘the gloomy, threatening preacher of repentance,’ would have found it difficult to be on terms of friendship with Jesus, he substitutes for the historical image of John in the Gospels one very different from that which really belongs to him.

⁵ Exod. xix. 10, 15.

while under his parents' roof ; but the absolute conviction which made him a prophet was imparted by the Spirit of the Lord, at the close of his youthful preparation, in the wilderness. First of all, he had the certainty that the Messiah was already living, though unknown, among the people ; then at the decisive moment, on the banks of the Jordan, he received a divine disclosure respecting His person. Such, therefore, was the presentiment, the inspiration, the function and divine mission of his life—to announce the advent of the Messiah, and to make a path for Him in the souls of the people. He was, so to speak, the individualized and final prophetic presentiment of the Messiah among His own people. And only thus, as the herald of Christ, is he an organically necessary and historically conceivable phenomenon.¹ But the prophet, from his wide, clear survey of the pilgrimages to Jerusalem, had from early life been cognizant of the moral and religious decay evinced in the temple-righteousness of his people. He saw through the corruption of the Pharisees and scribes with all the indignation of a genuine Israelite. The holy zeal of all the prophets was concentrated in the lofty repugnance of his powerful soul, and made him in a more restricted sense one of those men of zeal who appeared in Israel in critical moments, as restorers of the damaged Theocracy : such were Phinehas (Num. xxv. 7) and Elijah ; and such was Jesus Himself on the occasions when He purified the temple. In this zeal John became an administrator of baptism, or *the Baptist*. The whole nation appeared to him, as they really were, unworthy and incapable of entering the holy kingdom of the New Covenant, but most of all their leaders and representatives. It was to him a certain fact, that a great general declension had taken place from the spirit of true Judaism, and that even the better sort needed first to undergo a great purification to enable them to receive the King of Israel ; and that, after all, the winnowing fan of this King would be needed to separate the chaff from the wheat. The leaders of the people appeared to him mostly as serpents and vipers, in their thoroughly hypocritical natures, and the people in general polluted by the unclean beasts of their evil passions ; and thus, according to the law, a great universal purification was required.² The theocratic zealot, therefore, preached the baptism of repentance for the reception of the coming One. With unparalleled boldness he met the Israelitish community with the solemn declaration, that the whole camp was unclean, and that they must first undergo a holy ablution before they could enter into the new community. Thus he, in fact, excommunicated the whole nation, and prescribed for it a symbolical repentance, as a preparation for entering the social communion of the Messiah. The application which John, in his theocratic zeal,

¹ That John, on the contrary, the fabrication of antagonistic criticism, the gloomy monk who in his poor enthusiasm would fain be and ought to be a prophet, and yet is so little of a prophet that he has no presentiment of the Messiah when He comes into his immediate vicinity, and much too late arrives in prison at the conjecture that Jesus may be the Messiah—is a historical monster and a caricature of the biblical Baptist, which we may dispose of in a note, in passing.

² Lev. xiv. xv.

made of the rite of holy ablution to his polluted nation, accounts for the institution of his baptism. It was among the requirements of the law, that the Jewish proselytes were to undergo this washing when they passed over from the camp of the unclean, the heathen, to the camp of the clean, the Israelites. But John needed not this inducement to practise baptism. As restorer of the Theocracy, he recognized its necessity as soon as to his inspired theocratic wrath the conviction was established, that Israel had become a camp of the unclean. On the other hand, he too well understood the difference between symbolical and real acts, to confound with his own baptism the sprinkling with clean water which the prophets (Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Zech. xiii. 1) had foretold, and which in a figurative manner denoted the Spirit-baptism of Christ itself.¹ But still less could he fail to distinguish that symbolical act of which he was the administrator, from that anointing with oil which in the Old Testament represented the positive bestowment of the Messianic gifts of the Spirit, in distinction from the washing, which was the sign of negative consecration.² John was perfectly aware that the true essential Baptizer was to come, who would first baptize with the oil of life, with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. It was his own mission to restore the community as members of the old economy, in order to present them pure and set apart for the transition into the kingdom of heaven. What he required of the people was in perfect accordance with this mission. Each individual was to purify himself as an Israelite, to change his mind in earnest repentance, and in consequence to put away the evil of his life, and to practise the virtues belonging to his national calling. Thus would he be fitted for receiving the higher baptism, that of Christ, the real participation of His new, heavenly life.

The prophetic feeling of the Baptist did not deceive him. By those warnings with which, like a second Elijah, he stood forth in the wilderness of Judea, he succeeded in arousing and agitating the nation. The verdict of his zealous spirit, in which he described the theocratic commonwealth as polluted, and announced a baptism of purification, was acquiesced in by the people. They resorted to him at the Jordan in crowds. He received them with solemn reprimands, and exhorted them to conversion, and the practice of the neglected duties of mercy, brotherly love, honesty, and righteousness (Luke iii. 11-14). But as for those who were borne along with the tide of the excited multitudes, and only came to submit to the symbolic rite as a new instrument of ceremonial righteousness, he calls them 'a generation of vipers' (Luke iii. 7). They were induced to flee from the wrath to come, not by the Spirit of the Lord, but compelled by a regard to theocratic forms. Their fleeing was

¹ As for example, Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 351; also Neander, *Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 50.

² The same holds good of Christians of the apostolic age. How strictly the Essenes distinguished the washing from the anointing is acknowledged. Only within the pale of modern criticism can the Old Testament washing be confounded with the Old Testament anointing.

therefore pretended. They believed themselves, after all, to be safe from the coming wrath as children of Abraham. Therefore the prophet exclaimed, ‘Depend not on your descent; from these stones God can raise up children to Abraham.’ A spirit who could so mortify the Israelitish pride, who expressed in such strong terms the possibility of the call of the Gentiles into the kingdom of heaven, was no gloomy ascetic, no man of mere statutes. His words of rebuke were pointed quite specially at the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt. iii. 7). Whether they travelled in one caravan to the Jordan is not known; nor does it follow in the least from the language of the Evangelist. But at all events, to John’s spiritual vision they formed, according to their inner motives, a closely connected band, one caravan of hypocritical penitents. These Pharisees, indeed, followed the track of the people in their acknowledgment of John. The first powerful action of the prophet forced them to accommodate themselves to the popular feeling. They were also moved more or less by enthusiastic hopes of the advent of a Messiah according to their own mind. But as soon as the Pharisees stirred in this direction, the Sadducees were obliged to follow in their footsteps, according to their wont, in order to maintain before the people the appearance of orthodoxy.¹ But John understood their real character; and yet he could not refuse to baptize them, since he had to treat them according to their profession, not according to the thoughts of their heart. It was this contrariety which kindled his wrath into a glowing flame, and led him to employ the strongest terms of censure.² He could not deny them the possibility of reconciliation, but still felt himself compelled to announce the judgments which the Messiah would inflict on the wicked. In threatening accents he declared that the axe was laid at the root of the trees. With sadness he felt and confessed that he could baptize only with water the people as they stood before him, a mingled throng of persons eager for salvation, and of hypocritical pretenders. But it gave him consolation that he could announce a mightier One, before whose noble, kingly image his soul was humbled in the dust, with whom he dared not to associate himself, as being no better than a menial or a slave, since he had the feeling that he was not worthy of direct communion with Him.³ ‘I baptize you with water,’ he said, ‘but there cometh One after me who shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.’ Such was the Messiah in his sight; and thus was He to sanctify the people that they might become the people of the New Covenant. The baptism of fire must certainly be distinguished in this place from the baptism of the Spirit.⁴ This follows plainly from the image, according to which Christ purifies the grain of His threshing-floor with the winnowing fan, and then

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* xviii. 2.

² We may pass by the decision of Bruno Bauer on these threatening addresses of the Baptist.

³ Compare Matt. iii. 11 and the parallel passages. In these words we may find an answer to the question, Why the Baptist had not personally attached himself to the Lord?

⁴ Neander, *Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 55 [Bohn].

burns the chaff. But the Messiah, in fact, administers this twofold baptism in His whole career throughout the world's history. The saving effects of his administration through time will be supplemented by the judgments which result from the rejection of His salvation. This law strikingly shows in the destruction of Jerusalem, as well as in many other fire-baptisms of historic notoriety, how judgment impends over those circles in which the baptism of the Spirit is despised ; and so it will continue to the end of the world. It also holds good in the inner and outer life of the individual as he comes into contact with Christ—one of the two baptisms will be infallibly his portion. A man, in meeting with the Spirit of Christ, is either inflamed by the gentle glow of this Spirit, which arouses and purifies, renovates and transforms his life in all its depths ; or he begins to burn with a lurid flame of antichristian rancour in destructive enmity against the kingdom and word of Christ. But in the more general contemplation, the fire-baptism may without hesitation be identified with the Spirit-baptism of Christ ; and so much the more, because no one receives the salvation of the Christian spiritual life without passing through the fire of Christ's judgment.

That John formed a correct estimate of the supporters of the Jewish hierarchy, is proved by the attitude which they afterwards assumed against him. But equally was his confidence justified, that the Messiah was already living among the people. While many Pharisees had submitted to his baptism for the sake of appearance, Christ submitted in true obedience to this divine ordinance, because He thoroughly understood its significance for the people and for Himself.

NOTE.

John's manner of life was not a completely isolated phenomenon. It occurred more frequently as a link between the order of the Nazarites and that of the prophets or the rabbinical vocation, and exhibited what was true in Essenism, namely, an abstemious hermit-life, which in its strictness, as contrasted with the general mode of living, was dedicated only to the people's good. Such a recluse was Banus, the teacher of Josephus; his manner of life resembled that of John. See *Vita Josephi*, § 2; Neander's *Life of Christ*, § 34. Josephus mentions John the Baptist incidentally, *Antiq.* xviii. 5, § 2 : his account of John's baptism is not at variance with that of the Evangelists. He represents John as requiring the people, in order to gain the divine favour, not merely to put away from them this or that particular sin, but to purify their souls by righteousness, and to join with that the consecration of the body by baptism. The special gist of John's baptism, its relation to the kingdom of the Messiah, Josephus from his stand-point could not understand.¹

¹ [The chapter on John in Ewald's *Geschichte Christus* (pp. 146-160) is, as might be expected, one of the most suggestive in the book. The whole position of John is sketched by the hand of a master. His priestly birth and upbringing, his discovery of the urgent need of deliverance for Israel, his praying in the desert for the coming of the Messiah, his apparent resemblance to but real difference from Essenes and Pharisees, all are depicted in the most striking and instructive manner.—ED.]

SECTION III.

THE PARTICIPATION OF JESUS IN THE BAPTISM OF JOHN.

The significance of John's baptism, as explained in the preceding section, furnishes the simplest solution of the problem in modern theology, why Jesus submitted to that rite in order to fulfil all righteousness. Antagonistic critics have violently assailed the Apologetics of the Church with the question, How could Christ submit Himself to this baptism of repentance? At length they have distinctly proclaimed the consequence, that Christ, in submitting to John's baptism, presented a confession of His own sinfulness.¹ The explanations of the Church could not be satisfactory as long as the idea of the sacred ablutions of the Old Testament was not clearly understood.

According to the Mosaic law, not only the corporeally unclean in Israel, as for example lepers, but also those who had touched unclean animals, or in a similar way had, according to the Levitical typology, defiled themselves, were excommunicated from the camp of the typically pure congregation.² Readmission into the congregation could take place only after a given period, as was fitting for a case of uncleanness. But every Israelite whose object it was to recover the communion he had lost, was obliged to undergo the appointed religious ablution.

And not only those who were unclean in their own life, or had directly defiled themselves, but those who came in contact with them, were involved in that exclusion, and a similar ablution preceded their readmission into the congregation.³

According to this enactment of the law, Christ also was obliged to submit to John's baptism, as soon as He recognized it to be a purification of the people which John administered as a true prophet by an intimation of the Spirit of God. For He stood in the closest contact with the people who were regarded by the prophet as excommunicated. In God's sight He was pure; but according to the Levitical law, as restored by the theocratic authority of the Baptist, and made by him into a sermon of repentance, He was unclean through His connection with an unclean people. On the principles of the Old Testament righteousness, therefore, His baptism was required.

But the essential significance of the baptism of Jesus was the symbol of an actual relation. By baptism, Jesus was pointed out as the sacrificial Lamb of the world, laden with no other burden than His historical life-communion with the world. Considered in Himself alone, He might have had joy; but His connection with sin-laden humanity was the great reproach of His life, which led to His death. Thus His death became the real completion of the Israelitish baptism, and the foundation of baptism in its

¹ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 403. Compare Bruno Bauer, *Kritik.*, i. 207.
² Lev. xi. xiv. ³ Lev. xv. 5, 10, 11, 19, &c.

New Testament form and significance. John's baptism in its highest point was a typical prophecy of the death of Jesus; Christian baptism, on the other hand, is a sacramental representation of the same event.¹

But when Jesus came to be baptized, John the theocratic champion lost his lofty bearing. He who had reprimanded the members of the Sanhedrim as 'a generation of vipers,' exclaimed in tones of alarm to the consecrated Nazarene, 'I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me?' Thus the splendour of the New Testament broke forth from the verge of the Old.² But the sternness of the Old Testament flashed across the dawn of the New when Christ said, 'Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' Here the staves of the Old and New Testament righteousness form a cross. John represents the New Testament in the presence of Jesus; Jesus represents the Old Testament in the presence of John. The two economies manifest their relationship and unity by this junction of their contiguous links. We might say that the two covenants salute and bless one another in this holy rivalry; the one glorifies itself in the other, and from the glory of the first emerges the greater glory of the second.

But the determination of Jesus prevailed, for He came not to dissolve the law, but to fulfil it; and He well knew that this baptism expressed that consecration of death for His people which was spread over His life. But by this wonderful humility of Jesus, John was prepared to receive the positive revelation, that this was the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world. At that very instant the feeling must have agitated him, that Jesus was necessitated only by communion with His people to submit to the humiliating ordinance of baptism—that He bore the sins of His people.

NOTES.

1. Strauss remarks, that according to Matt. iii. 6, John appears to have required a confession of sins before baptism. Hence it would follow, that Jesus by submitting to baptism favoured the supposition that He was a sinner. The whole difficulty is obviated by the representation given above of the import of the baptism of Jesus. But, in addition, it is well to observe, that according to the words of Matthew, baptism and the confession of sins were identical. But the moment of immersion was naturally not suited to allow the persons immersed to utter a verbal confession of sins. If,

¹ When Ebrard (*Gospel History*, 194) denies the relation of baptism to the Jewish ablutions, this view of the subject is not confirmed. On the other hand, his remark, which regards baptism as a rite going beyond simple ablution, as far as it involves an immersion of the body, altogether confirms it, if only it is borne in mind that this modification must be considered as a prophetic elevation of the legal form of sacred ablution. According to Ebrard, the baptism of John presents a sign 'that man altogether deserves death.' Yet we cannot admit that John baptized with this consciousness, without maintaining that there was in his baptism an anticipation of the Christian. But his baptism was certainly a typical sign of the death of Jesus, and consequently also of mankind's desert of death.

² [Ewald calls this 'the birth-hour of Christianity.'—ED.]

therefore, the persons baptized were (*ἐξομολογούμενοι*) confessing at this moment, they were so in the act. But this confession of sins was, as we have seen, according to its nature a social and solidaric (*solidarisches*) act by which the measure of the guilt or innocence of individuals was not determined. In the infinite reciprocal action of social defilement in which individuals in Israel stood before the law, a separation of the individual from the whole body was impracticable. So, then, every one confessed in his own manner, individualizing and modifying his confession more or less—the collective guilt of Israel. Hardly would so many Pharisees have consented to an individual confession before John. But Christ's confession was this: 'So it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness.' Social righteousness drew Him down into the stream.

2. The ideas *μετανοία* (repentance), *ἀφεσις ἀμαρτιῶν* (remission of sins), and *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* (the kingdom of heaven), stand in reciprocal action to one another. The one is as deep as the other, and each has always a significance differently determined on the legal, the pharisaical, the prophetic, and the Christian stand-point. The purely legal stand-point is that of the typical rendering of satisfaction and of social atonement, in connection with an unlimited apprehension of the relations of Being corresponding to this symbolism. The pharisaic stand-point accomplishes the social satisfaction and atonement with a more decided dependence on outward works, without the perception of a higher righteousness. The prophetic stand-point deduces from the social satisfaction and atonement the full feeling of the defect of realizing this symbolism in spirit, and of hope in the Messiah. John pronounces the whole Old Testament righteousness to be water-baptism. The Christian stand-point exhibits, in all the points indicated, the fulfilling of the symbol in full spiritual reality.

SECTION IV.

THE MANIFESTATION OF THE MESSIAH TO THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL.

(Matt. iv.; Mark i.; Luke iii.; John i.)

Jesus complied with the call of the law when He repaired to the Jordan to be baptized by John.¹ But in the consciousness of His own purity and divine dignity, He must have deeply felt that on this occasion He only bore the burden of His people. An appointment of righteousness like this, which made Him the associate of the self-accusers and penitents who presented themselves before the Baptist, must have appeared to Him very ominous of the grave character of His future career. But His heart was already accustomed to sympathize with the sufferings of humanity. Even at an earlier period the fact must have become clear to Him, that all the

¹ [Tradition gives us the 6th January as the day of the baptism; and for a description of the place by Arculf, see Bohn's *Early Travels in Palestine*, p. 8.—ED.]

burden of earth fell precisely on His heart, since His heart exhibited the centre and the depths of humanity. But He also had already learnt to know the exaltation which always follows the sufferings inflicted on a child of God. Hence He must have come to His baptism with great expectations, with the hope of a wonderful declaration by His Father, while He clearly perceived what was humiliating in His baptism, the suffering for His people which it implied. As at a later period He met death with the confident expectation of His resurrection and exaltation to glory with the Father, so also He came to His baptism, which was a prefiguration of His death, with the certain expectation that the Father would testify to His honour in the hour of His ignominy.

That Jesus was certain of the divine mission of John, is shown by the decisiveness with which He offered Himself for baptism at his hands. Lately some have wished to make out that He was a disciple of John.¹ So He was, for a single moment, when He allowed John to immerse Him in the stream, and thus recognized John's theocratic commission.

But John did not at once fully apprehend the significance of Christ's person. This is easily explained. He had to testify of one greater than himself with prophetic certainty. Such a task is in itself infinitely difficult, and indeed, without the guidance of God's Spirit, impossible.

That John and Jesus were acquainted in their youth, may be inferred with great probability from the relation in which their families stood to each other. How many times they might see one another at the feasts in Jerusalem, perhaps look on one another with thoughtful interest! On those occasions John might be much assisted by the utterances of Jesus in understanding the nature of the Theocracy, and in estimating the spirit of the existing hierarchy and their method of guiding the religion of the people. But by such intercourse the consciousness must early have been unfolded in both, that though their lives and spheres of action were to be closely linked, yet they were not destined to coincide. Every superior individuality has a strong feeling of an especial sphere of life, by which its outward relation and conduct towards other individuals is determined; and the purer it is, so much the more decidedly does it follow this consciousness in reference to the historic boundaries and position of its life. There is also in the spiritual world a repulsive force as unerring, and even more so than the centrifugal force of the heavenly bodies, which, in connection with the force of attraction, establishes the organism of the universe. It is too agreeable a view, taken from an inferior sphere of life, to imagine that the great champions of God, John and Jesus, had their paths in life ordained by God to be contiguous, and that these, as their strong

¹ [So Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 107 : 'Loin que le Baptiste ait abdiqué devant Jésus, Jésus pendant tout le temps qu'il passa près de lui, le reconnaît pour supérieur et ne développa son propre génie que timidement. Il sembla en effet que, malgré sa profonde originalité, Jésus, durant quelques semaines au moins, fut l'imitateur de Jean.' —ED.]

natures unfolded, so coincided, that they maintained a close private intercourse, or were associated in outward co-operation. Inward fellowship in the kingdom of God does not as a matter of course lead to an outward companionship. Of John we are informed that he was 'in the wilderness' (Luke iii. 2). He was of a profoundly earnest, hermit-like, pensively pious character, the last and worthy representative of the Old Testament. The whole bent of his mind attracted him into the wilderness. The Old Testament economy had its birth-place in the wilderness, and thither with John it returned to die. Probably a modest reverence, as a rule, kept him at a distance from Jesus; and among other things, he might feel a sad and sombre estrangement from the cheerful gracefulness with which Jesus entered on His great conflict with the world—an inability to value at once the power of His refined agency, and fully to enter into His New Testament spirit.

But the reverence he felt for Jesus, the youthful anticipation that in Him bloomed the hope of Israel, and even the blissful presentiment that Jesus was the Messiah, could not, after all, qualify him to be a public witness for Him. As the prophet of the Messiah he knew nothing officially of Jesus; he knew Him not, so long as he was not assured by God. No female influence could ever induce him to be precipitate in this matter, and do violence to his calling; not even the judgment of those eminent women, Elisabeth and Mary. Whoever comprehends the significance of a prophetic, divine certainty, would not desire that John should deliver the reminiscences of his youth to the people in the name of Jehovah, and hastily alarm the land and the people with monstrous hypotheses. When Jesus came to him, he might indicate to Him at once his own expectations. The impression which this exalted friend made upon him had perhaps often overpowered him; at all events, it did so now. His own official dignity fell from him at the feet of Jesus; he started difficulties as to baptizing Him. Still he had not yet that final, objective divine certainty respecting the Messianic dignity of Jesus which he required, in order to bear open testimony to Him; and for this reason, because he had received the assurance that God would accredit the Messiah to him by an infallible sign. This sign was granted him when Jesus came up from His baptism.¹

It must here particularly be borne in mind, that the reporter respecting this wonderful transaction, namely, John, did not stand on the height of a decidedly New Testament view. The miracle

¹ [The apparent inconsistency between Matt. iii. 14 and John i. 33 has tested the sagacity of interpreters. Alford is of opinion that already John regarded Jesus as the Messiah, and could not but do so from the nature of their relationship, but that he still required the sign from God which would justify him in announcing Him to Israel. Ellicott, in a characteristically cautious note (*Hist. Lect.* p. 107), seems to ascribe too little to John's former acquaintance with, or at least knowledge of our Lord; and Ewald certainly does so (*Geschichte Christus*, p. 163, cf. 185) when he supposes that John's shrinking was due to what he learnt of Jesus when He came to his baptism, by conversing with Him as he conversed with all who presented themselves for baptism. Rüggenbach (*Vorlesungen über das Leben des Herrn Jesu*, Basle, 1858, p. 240) here, as frequently elsewhere, follows Lange.—ED.]

must have assumed for him an appearance which was conformable to his power of contemplation. Therefore the miracle at the baptism of Jesus is narrated according to John's phenomenology, and not according to the christological phenomenology. And owing to this, it has been possible for the ancient and modern Ebionites, Socinians, and other advocates of a mutilated Christology, to support their views by the letter of this narrative, and to regard the anointing of Christ with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven as contradictory to the doctrine of the eternal divinity of Christ, and of His miraculous conception by the Holy Spirit.¹

As Christologists, we must assert the fundamental position, that there can be no holier place in the universe than the heart of Jesus. For when in our inner contemplation we contrast the Father with the Son, the Father is without time and place, comprehending and filling all things. Hence it belongs to the phenomenology of the Baptist when the representation presupposes a place in heaven over the heart of Christ, whence the Holy Spirit descends upon Him.

Jesus had immersed Himself by the prayer of the heart in the abyss of Deity, even while He was being immersed in the stream. Baptism was His solemn consecration to God and to death. By this great public surrender to the Father, His consciousness as the Messiah was completed, His calling decided. He was infinitely moved by the fulness of the divine Spirit, and in the illumination of this Spirit the certainty of His eternal unity in God, His Sonship, and the evidence of His calling and course of life, were completely disclosed to Him. The rose at last requires only a single sunbeam to complete its unfolding. The unfolding of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus was completed at His baptism; but equally so the public certainty of His Messiahship; for this the Baptist had to advocate before all the people.

As Jesus rose out of the water praying, the divine greeting from the Father, 'Thou art My beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased,' went through His soul with infinite power, fervency, and splendour. This inner voice was the central point of the miracle. But it penetrated the Lord not merely in a spiritual manner, but resounded audibly through His frame: it so filled Him that all the chords of His life, even those of hearing, sounded simultaneously.

According to the law of sympathy, this voice must have echoed in the related but weaker person of John with thrilling power, 'This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' He also heard the call, because the voice of God caused his whole life to vibrate. Suddenly he beheld a visible sign. He saw the heavens open, and the Spirit descending in an outward visible form ($\sigmaωματικῶς$ εἶδει), like a dove, upon Jesus, and abiding upon Him.

But we must distinguish, as we have already intimated, the

¹ [The Gnostics believed that Jesus was one person, Christ another; and that these were united for a time at His baptism, but again separated before His crucifixion. Full information on this point is given in the very learned and careful work of Burton, *An Inquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age* (Oxford, 1829), pp. 186 and 469.—ED.]

essential component parts of this phenomenon from the form which it obtained in John's contemplation of it. Three particular signs compose the one great sign whereby Jesus was pointed out to him by God as the Messiah. The first is the open heaven; the second, the visible appearance over the head of Jesus; the third is the voice. We believe that from the christological stand-point the order must be reversed. The voice was the greeting, and responsive greeting of eternal love in the heart of Christ resounding in the spirit-world,—the celebration of the perfected revelation of the Father in the Son, of the divine feeling of Christ in His unity with the Father. Now did He begin as a living fountain of the Spirit of God to spread abroad the breath and life of this Spirit; the Spirit emanated from Him as the scent is shed forth from the full-blown rose. But this first great life-stream of the Spirit in Him began in a solemn inspiration which flashed and lightened through His whole frame. At this moment the first rays of Christ's glorification broke forth. A mysterious splendour, probably a white mild lustre like the flutter of a white dove on the wing in the sunbeams, hovered above His head. John on his stand-point beheld it gliding downwards. But probably an upward and downward movement of this mild lustre took place; namely, a balancing or adjustment of the life of Christ entering into the phenomenon, with that world of light which lies at the basis of the whole phenomenal world, and as a locality forms the first inheritance of His glory. We understand this balancing or adjustment thus—Christ is the spiritual life-principle of the world, and therefore specially the principle of the renovation of the world of men, and of their sphere the habitable globe. At this moment His human consciousness of God was completed. His inner light-nature broke forth in the feeling of triumph which pervaded Him at this instant. It was the foretelling of His transfiguration on the Mount and at the Ascension, and consequently of the transfiguration of humanity in the new world by His glorification, as well as the transfiguration of the earthly sphere, as that must supervene with the glory of Christian humanity. But when this ray of the world's transfiguration breaks forth from the life of Christ, the discord ceases which existed between this earthly sphere and the heavenly light-sphere, which as an ideal region forms its opposite in the universe, making up its life. Christ Himself in His corporeal nature had a share in this discord, since this nature, although pure and complete as an organ and image of the divine Spirit, yet was incorporated with actual humanity, and by His whole life-communion with it shared in the darkness and heaviness of its corporeity. As therefore the life-fulness of the Spirit streamed forth from the consciousness of Christ, the transforming power of this life broke through the earthly obscuration of His organism, and by this sacred emanation of His ethereal life-power, the relation to that region of light was called forth. A downward streaming of its light met the upward shining of the light-life of Christ. But after the first festive meeting of these lights, the relation was continued

in a more quiet form. The assimilation effected, of the nature of Christ with the region of His glory, allowed the reciprocal acting to retire again into the invisible, till a new enhancement of the same relation caused it to come forth at a later period still more powerfully. This adjustment between heaven and Christ may also be simply regarded as an adjustment between heaven and earth, since Christ is the principle of the earth's glorification. And whoever is inclined to the Christian expectation, that the earth must one day be changed into a heavenly world of light by the energy of Christ, that a transformation of it into the imperishable is approaching through the palingenesia which the Spirit of Christ effects—let him so conceive it, that in that moment in which the heart of Christ enjoyed the full unfolding of His heavenly consciousness in conformity to the intimate connection of the spiritual and corporeal, the bloom of this world's glorification glistened on His head. But in the glorification of the world the alternation of day and night will hereafter vanish; the earth will be seen as a star encircled by the great family of stars. In their new light-life the sun will no more quench the radiance of the surrounding stars, while the earth will be free, as a co-enlightening star, from the sun's overpowering light.¹ And therein will also one day appear the signs of the Son of man in heaven (Matt. xxiv. 30); so that, by means of the great transformation of the earth, the stars will begin to be constantly visible to the earth as clearly as sometimes on the high mountain tops the stars blaze like torches on the dark blue expanse of heaven. But it is well known that even now there are moments in the day-time when single stars are visible. Such a moment probably was that, when Jesus and John from their stand-point beheld the great adjustment between heaven and earth. In the undulation of the light-world between the head of Christ and heaven, the depth of heaven was opened. They probably, therefore, saw the stars come forth in the dark blue, and as it were joyously enwreathe the earth, which now, as thus encircled, seemed the holiest spot in the universe. So in this world-historical single moment, that transformation of the world which it establishes and brings about as a principle, was exhibited in a passing but grand foretelling to the actor and the witness of the moment.

We have already noticed on what account John necessarily saw this transaction through an Old Testament medium. But it attests the vivid anticipation of the New Testament life in the soul of this great man, that he compared the Holy Spirit to the image of a gentle dove² gliding down from heaven, as he designated the Son

¹ Rev. xxi. 23. See Göschel, *Unterhaltungen zur Schilderung Göthescher Dicht- und Denkweise*, iii. 191.

² That we are not to think of an actual dove gliding down on the head of Christ, the theologian ought to know from the fact that the Israelites were forbidden to regard the cry of birds as an omen (Lev. xix. 26). ['The form was real' (Ellicott); it was not only the manner of descent, but the descending bodily form which was like that of a dove. It was not a dove which had been before this time living somewhere on earth (Paulus thinks it was a dove accidentally passing by), any more than

of God by the title of the Lamb. This heavenly power of Christ's infinitely gentle Spirit-life, which John most wanted in his own life, so full of passionate zeal, but yet in the spirit of humility knew how to value in another. It was exactly those features of Christ's life in which he was most decidedly surpassed that filled his soul with the profoundest reverence; he therefore designated Christ 'the Lamb,'¹ and the spirit of His life a 'dove.'

John was now most certainly convinced of the Messiahship of Christ by the testimony of God, and in the blessedness of this new great certainty he could deliberately say, in reference to his former way and manner of contemplating Him, 'I knew Him not.' It was now that he first knew Him as a prophet, so that he could with confidence testify of Him in Israel. But this was decisive in a man whose private life was so perfectly identified with his public calling, and who wished to be only 'a voice' to proclaim the coming Messiah. Filled with astonishment at the glory of this revelation which had been imparted to him, and at the glory of the personage in whom he now realized the hope of his life, he could say with the deepest emphasis, 'I knew Him not.' The conscientiousness and critical judgment of the man were great, like himself,—the last of the old prophets, who spoke not of their own will or opinion, but as they were moved and actuated by the Holy Ghost.

Thus was Jesus now made manifest to the people of Israel as the Son of God and the Messiah. For John represented the theocratic majesty of Israel, the true host of the people. But whether on this occasion the two men of God were surrounded by many witnesses or few, was in this case of no special importance. At all events, the bystanders could only share in their experience in proportion as they were qualified by the sympathy of a life and disposition in harmony with John and Christ.

NOTES.

1. The objective truth of the testimony which the Baptist has left behind of the mysterious transaction at the baptism of Jesus, may be inferred from the Old Testament colouring which it must have gained in his contemplation of it, the effect of which has led into error minds that were deficient in New Testament depth or ripeness.

2. The effulgence (*Verklärung*) will come under consideration in the sequel. As to the adjustment (*Ausgleichung*) between the earthly nature of Christ and His light-world (*Lichtwelt*), the idea of such adjustment or equalization already exists in natural philosophy, though it is applied with uncertainty to the mysterious phenomena of nature-life. Thus, for instance, Faraday conjectures

the human forms of the angels appearing to Abraham were real men, though they exercised the functions of substantial bodies. It was a real appearance assumed (how we know not) for the time being, like the tongues of fire afterwards chosen to symbolize a special gift of the Holy Ghost.—ED.]

¹ [This, of course, does not exclude the sacrificial significance of the name, as brought out in the preceding section.—ED.]

that the electrical equilibrium of the earth is restored by the aurora borealis, by its carrying the electricity from the poles to the equator. According to others, the aurora borealis is a streaming of light from the earth to the sun, while the zodiacal light is an opposite current which connects the sun with the earth.

3. On the significance of the dove in the Hebrew symbolic, see Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 416. Von Ammon, i. 276: 'The dove was universally considered by Jews and heathens to be an emblem of purity and chastity.' Yet John needed not to take the symbol from tradition; he was great enough to form on his own authority a symbol of this kind, especially in allusion to Solomon's Song, ii. 14.

4. The voice of God cannot proceed from any particular place, since God is omnipresent. It is a living and definite expression of God; a *special* word of God, which creates its own voice in the sphere wherein it sounds, as the *general* word of God has created its sound and echo in the universe. But this voice has a full reality, since it is an expression and operation of God. It is consistent with this immediateness of the divine voice, that God speaks in the language of the persons to whom His word is addressed. Every one who can conceive the difference between Judaism and Heathenism ought to know that the Hebrews never imagined the divine essence to be confined in a dwelling-place above the firm vault of heaven. So also the way and manner in which the speech of God is articulated, and becomes the language of a particular country, must be plain to every one who is not disposed to regard the manifestation of God in the flesh as 'monstrous.'

5. The question, whether the manifestation was designed for Jesus, or only for John (see Neander, *Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 70 [Bohn]), loses sight too much of the peculiar life of this singular moment, in which one of the two prophets could receive no revelation without its also being imparted to the other. Jesus was the centre of the miraculous transaction; but John stood most of all in need of this manifestation in order to fulfil his calling.

6. The message which the Baptist sent from his prison to Jesus must, according to Strauss, imply a contradiction to the confidence of the Baptist, as here described in reference to the person of Jesus. In the sequel we shall consider the question, whether the human weakness in the life of the prophet can be taken as evidence against his utterance in the elevated hours of his divine assurance.

SECTION V.

THE GOD-MAN.¹

Christ, from the beginning of His life in His human nature, was one with God, and indeed in the oneness [*Einzigkeit*] of the Son.

¹ [For an estimate of the author's Christology, reference must be made to the last volume of Dorner on the Person of Christ. And see also his own vindication of himself from the charges of Krummacher, in the Note appended to sec. ix.—ED.]

His oneness in God consisted in this—that His life formed the pure realized centre of all God's counsels, the innermost secret of all His thoughts and ways in the world's history, and that it possessed the infinitely pure and rich nobleness which naturally belonged to the heart of the world. The holy child was the bud in which the world was to open into a divine flower—into a heaven of pure ideal relations which embraced the infinite contents of life in the oneness of an absolutely new form, in the delicacy of a perfected harmony or bloom of all life. But the oneness of the Son of God was in Him the movement of an infinitely pure and delicate impulse of development, in which His nature from the first preserved its identity with the Spirit of God,—the perfect harmony in the reciprocal action between His corporeal and spiritual nature, and between His soul and the world. His life's impulse was the impulse of eternal love breaking forth from its development. 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,' 2 Cor. v. 19. The eternal self-consciousness of God came forth in the development of the consciousness of Christ into the midst of the world, and in this manner became a manifestation of His being.

This manifestation needed first of all to be completed in the human consciousness of Jesus; but its completion coincided with the complete development of His inner life. The starting-point of this unfolding was the refined living joy of a perfectly consecrated, well-organized nature, kept down by the adverse impression of a darkened, deeply disordered world of sinners, opposing the glory of such a life. Its progress from the indistinct feeling of pure life to the highest living certainty was a wonderful presage; it was the beautiful dawn of the new world, the life-poetry of an unfolding consciousness, which in its all-comprehensive, quiet life passed through all the sights and feelings of the longing, imaginative youth of the world. We have been made acquainted with one aspect of this beautiful dawn in the history of Jesus when twelve years old. Through this blessed longing the terrors of the kingdom of darkness must have been acting their part in strange nocturnal sights and shades of horror—such presentiments as Abraham, the father of the faithful, had in glancing at the future of his people and spiritual descendants (Gen. xv. 12). But the objective world of God presented itself to this longing as a pure, divine administration, which increased in lustre from the darkest night (*Aethernacht*) to the clearest noon-day.

As long as this richest individual development was burdened with any of the uncertainty which attaches to a period of growth, Christ could not come forth and manifest Himself to the people of Israel as the Messiah. Nor could this development be completed by one-sided human evidence, but only by a wonderful transaction in which the testimony of the Father in the voice which blessed Him coincided with the testimony of His inner life, and the testimony of the ancient Theocracy, which was represented by the Baptist, with the voice of His heart, and finally the testi-

mony of heaven and earth with that of His previous history. This singular harmony of His religious, theocratic, and physical spheres with the expression of His inner life was the most special significance of the miracle at His baptism. He was now made manifest in the world as the God-man from whom it had to expect its salvation.

His own word unveils to us the form of the inner life of Jesus. He walked in the presence of God, and bore within Himself the fulness of the Godhead. The pure reality of the world identified Him with the divine administration; He knew Himself to be surrounded, conditioned, penetrated, and determined by God's Spirit. He was therefore in heaven (John iii. 13), in the bosom of the Father (John i. 18), and simply conditioned by the will of the Father (John v. 30). In the looks with which the Father beheld Him—in the design with which He upheld Him—in the fatherly love which begat, saluted, and sent Him, He felt His own oneness, His eternity and divinity. In this consciousness He regarded His own life as a pure manifestation of the Father (John xiv. 9, 10), as a glorification of His being (John xvii. 4). It was His life-conviction that the very Being of God was manifested through Him in the midst of the world. He thus expressed His divine consciousness—He came from the Father, and He went to the Father. His going to the Father was an eternal act of His consciousness. He was perfectly conscious of the infinitely delicate distinctness of His life, His unique individuality. He felt the singularity of His life which placed Him in the presence of God's love, as the pure image of the Father. He exhibited the determination of God which lay in His divine consciousness, in perfect, free self-determination. His will might appear as distinct from the will of God, but only in order to be merged in it with freedom. In His feelings, He could feel Himself forsaken by God in His objective administration, but only in order to surrender and sacrifice Himself to Him. In His acting, He could feel Himself excited by the immeasurable activity of the Father throughout the universe to work Himself, but only to work the works of the Father in and with Him (John v. 17). It was therefore His human consciousness, that He was ever going again to the Father as the pure, perfected Man.

In this relation the divine consciousness in Christ stands to His human consciousness. The two forms of this consciousness, therefore, in accordance with their nature, make up one living unity. Whoever has not found God, has not found Himself; and whoever has not come to Himself, has not come to God. God becomes one with man, and man with God, in the life of the Spirit. Where spirit appears, there freedom appears. Spiritual personality recognizes its destiny, which is from God, and determines itself in the most living free experience and firm hold of this destiny. Those who fancy that with the beginning of the spiritual life, God vanishes in the power of their self-consciousness, are ignorant of

spirit, and not less so are those who wish to see their life vanish in God. The Spirit glorifies man in God, and God in man. But Christ had the Spirit in its infinite fulness; and for that reason God was the eternally glorious object of contemplation to His inner life, and he was conscious of the eternal peerlessness and singleness of His life in God. Thus His divine consciousness was one with His individual consciousness, and in this living unity the one is precisely distinguished from the other by the Spirit. He lived in an eternal, infinitely intimate, reciprocal action with the Father. This reciprocal action was a perfect, ever pure, and beautiful rhythm. In this rhythm of His life, as it is sustained by His unique nature and destiny, He appears as the God-man.

The blessedness and power of this life never allowed the Lord to withdraw from the consciousness of eternity. Sin from the first must have been detestable as gloom to His brightness,—as nihility to His power of being,—as the dissonant and deformed to the harmony of His life,—as estrangement from God to His fulness of God. The God-man, according to the power of His freedom, could not consent to sin.

And yet it lay in the nature of His being, that He must be more tempted by sin than any other man. Sin as sin was repelled by the divine power of His self-determination; while sin as the old human life continually troubled and agitated, yea, tortured to death, the human delicacy of His nature. Who could be so sensitive as He to the temptations which lay in the sympathy and antipathy of a whole disordered world, whose head and heart He was destined to be? Who could be more susceptible in his individual feelings than He to the attraction of the sympathy of the world, which, with an unceasing syren-song, wished to draw Him down into the depths of its old life? Who could experience as He did the repulsion of the world's antipathy to the transition from the kingdom of the darkened life of nature to the blessed kingdom of the Spirit? In Him there was the most delicate sense of honour—the concentrated noble-mindedness of all humanity, infinitely sensitive, confronting all the shocks of worldly contumely—the most excitable and tender life-feeling confronting all the sharp pangs of death—the highest capability of suffering belonging to the strongest, and therefore most thoughtful love, confronting the thousandfold forms of human hatred. In one word, we may say that Christ alone could and must feel the entire temptation of the world; and He alone, who perfectly understood and experienced it in the full clearness of His pure feeling and spirit, could completely overcome it. Those that think man becomes acquainted with temptation only in proportion as he is defiled by it, lay down a canon by which man throughout eternity would have, like another Sisyphus, to roll the load of sinfulness in his vain struggles after righteousness. Their moral world is from the first only a modest hell for those who are silently condemned. But every victory of an honest conscience over temptation refutes their system. Christ has converted

into historical truth the possibility of the sinless development of humanity, which in Adam, as ideal, formed the paradise of humanity, and thus has founded the new heavens of the world's reconciliation.

The power of Christ's life to resist temptation lay in His ideal nature. But by His historical nature, by His connection with humanity, He was necessitated to encounter all the temptations of humanity; and His victory over temptation was effected by realizing His ideal life in His historical life. The victory lay simply in this realization. For when He, the Chief of Humanity, came armed on the field of conflict, in order to rescue it from the corruption into which it had fallen, then the whole depth of this corruption must unfold itself and confront Him. The demoniac background which supported this world of confusion was forced to disclose itself simultaneously when the heavenly basis of the ideal human world was laid in the incarnation of God. This was a consequence of the antagonistic historical reciprocal action between the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness. In opposition to the God-man, when, as Redeemer of the world, He was manifested by His baptism in the Jordan, the Demon-enemy of man, the Tempter, now made his appearance.

NOTE.

The correct view of the relation between the divine and human natures of Christ is still obscured by various false assumptions. The first of these is the notion that the divine life was limited by the human, and in consequence could only partially (which as divine is in that case not at all) enter into human life. On the contrary, it has been pointed out in the first part of our work, that the essence of human individuality is to be looked for not in its finiteness, but in its *definiteness*. But this definiteness can be no hindrance to God in His manifestation, since it is a result of His determination. With this false assumption another is connected, that the incarnation of the Son of God is considered in itself a humiliation of His being, while His humiliation only appears in His entering into a life-communion with historical humanity. The *μορφὴ Θεοῦ* which is attributed to Christ in Philip. ii. 6, is to be regarded probably as the definiteness of the divine nature, in which Christ has the eternal ideality of His being.¹ To this essential 'form of God' attributed to Christ, the 'being equal with God,' *τὸ εἶναι Ἰσα Θεῷ*, corresponds. We can take this plural *ἴσα* as altogether definite, and then it will mark the various forms through which the Logos passed before He became man; since first of all He was the principle of the creation of the world, then the principle of humanity, and next of the Theocracy, till last of all He became the life-principle of Jesus. The expression, 'He thought it not robbery to be equal with God' (*οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἤγήσατο*),

¹ ['The Godhead itself, so far as it is exhibited in the brightest manifestations of the grace and majesty of God.' Witsius, *De Oratione*, cap. i.—ED.]

does not mean He did not eagerly retain this equality with God, but divested Himself of it; rather, the *ἴσα εἶναι Θεῷ* remained His, even when He became man. But His divine consciousness was not the consciousness of a possession unlawfully gained by force; or, more exactly, it was no act of outrage, as when a robber or a warrior violently seizes his booty. The feeling of His divine dignity was no ecstasy. It was perfectly matured human life; and so also divine in tranquillity, love, and condescension. His divine life-feeling was the ripest, most tranquil enjoyment of His inner being, no spirit-robbery. So little was He disposed to attain His glory by robbery, that He rather robbed Himself when He assumed the form of a servant, and was made like the sinful race of men, even to the death of the cross. This self-robbery can only relate to the manifestation of life. He robbed Himself when He concealed the divine glory of His consciousness in the sinner's garb of man, in the servant's garb of the Jews, in the criminal's garb of the crucified, and therefore with infinite humility in a threefold dress of the deepest humiliation.¹

Another false assumption confounds the identity which is presented in the spirit-life with the monotony of a physical unity, and consequently allows man to vanish into God, or God into man. In both cases spirit is *naturalized*, that is, denied.

As a third assumption, we may specify the hypothesis of the latest moral philosophy, which makes Evil a necessary point of transition in the moral development of the spirit. Perhaps this assumption is taken from the use of cow-pox, which is destined to put a stop to the ravages of small-pox, and has been transplanted into the doctrine of spiritual freedom. At all events, it is only at home in the physical department of life.

SECTION VI.

THE TEMPTER.

No reciprocal action is more delicate, mysterious, and important than that of spiritual forces in the ethical department of life. As long as this reciprocal action is overlooked—as long, therefore, as the doctrine of sympathies and antipathies is not more developed than it has hitherto been, there can be no satisfactory development of the doctrine of good and evil in the world. Every spiritual individual must be regarded as a spiritual power, operating not only by

¹ [This interpretation does not seem to bring out the opposition expressed by ἀλλά with as much distinctness as the ordinary view, which refers μορφὴ Θεοῦ to the pre-incarnate, and μορφὴ δούλου to the incarnate state of Christ. Besides the commentaries, some useful hints on this important passage will be found in Pearson *On the Creed*, p. 179 (ed. 1835), and Moses Stuart's *Letters to Rev. W. E. Channing*, p. 81 (ed. 1829). The doctrinal significance of the κένωσις is fully treated in Dorner, II. iii. 250–259; and its discussion is further pursued by Liebner, in the *Jahrb. für D. Theol.* 1858, p. 349. Dorner and Hasse have also papers on the subject in the same year.—ED.]

speaking and acting, but by his very existence, presence, and disposition, and especially by his will, and thus influencing other individuals in the elements of social life. But the greater the power of the individual, so much more important will be his agency.

In the human world these silent forces of individual power and disposition are at work incessantly in every direction. Powerful effects proceed from powerful characters, and form greater or smaller nets in which a multitude of weaker characters are caught. There are spirits that rule in the air (Eph. v. 12).

The history of battles will teach us the mighty power of sympathetic relations. The panic which causes the loss of a battle, is entirely a sympathetic fright. When a little group of gallant hearts, who form the flower of a regiment, flinch and give way, the whole regiment may be lost, and with that the whole army. And so, on the other hand, the heroic self-sacrifice of a single man may rally a whole wavering host, and even, flashing like lightning through centuries, may rekindle in a nation the flame of a holy enthusiasm. The pillars of fire of genuine human heroism are the noble lights of history, which make us feel at ease even while sojourning among spectres, and horrors, and graves.

But antipathy is not less powerful than sympathy, and, taken together, they contribute one phenomenon, which may be designated psychical life-communion. Of this phenomenon, sympathy forms the positive and antipathy the negative pole; and the latter consequently is, in its kind, as powerful as the former. It is easier to sail against the wind than to withstand or break through strong antipathies. We call, and there is no echo. 'My word,' said the Saviour, 'hath no place in you,' John viii. 37. We address ourselves to human hearts, and it is like running against heaps of stones. It is a hard matter to be cheerful, and keep up one's spirits, when soul does not answer soul. Christ withstood the antipathy of the whole world. This conflict especially was His chief labour in Gethsemane and on Golgotha. He trod the wine-press alone. And since His victory, the preponderance of His strong heart goes in triumph through the world, and, amidst fearful reactions of the antipathy of the old world-nature, it causes, by the thunders and lightnings of sympathetic action, all things to bow which are in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth.

It lies in the nature of this relation, that evil as well as good can enter into the moving power of sympathy, and as the checking power of an antipathy. Those who have been overcome by the power of evil, strengthen its operation by the attraction of sympathy; but it confronts the good as a magically obstructive and repressive antipathy. Who has not experienced the depressing influence of evil in its silent and most secret operations? In Göthe's Faust, Margaret makes the discovery that she cannot pray in the presence of Mephistopheles. Every material spark, however small, has its effect: it glows, it gleams, it threatens to kindle a fire. But far more powerful is the operation of a spark of evil. Evil in the heart

of our neighbour speaks to us through the mere power of its existence: if he does not express it in words, it is impressed upon us in some most occult way, and can make a language for itself, intelligible to our hearts and imaginations.

But there are some minds so very obtuse, that they are not sensible of evil unless it comes before them palpably in words and deeds absolutely immoral. They know no alarm at the demon-like power of evil. Such persons are in truth very poor demonologists.

Many others see the boundaries of evil where crime, and vice, or gross immorality cease in their immediate circle; but they have no feeling of the power of evil lying at a greater depth, working in concealment, or acting at a distance. These likewise are weak demonologists.

But there are also other spirits, purer, deeper, and of greater moral sensibility,—souls like Cassandra, who feel the action of the curse breaking forth in the misdeeds of domestic life; or like Thecla, who experience an internal horror when a dark spirit goes through their house. These souls are the true moral philosophers, while technical moral philosophy is sometimes in the hands of ethically callous spirits.

Lastly, there are heroes of world-wide reputation with moral feelings of the highest order; souls that can perceive an ethical agency of prodigious power where an ordinary man would scarcely notice anything; souls that would see a conflagration where the latter would hardly detect the smell of fire. Such a distinguished example of moral perception Christ proved Himself to be, when Peter so urgently dissuaded Him from the dangerous journey to Jerusalem (Matt. xvi. 22). But these heroes, as prophets of the ethical depths of the world, have, with their feeling and penetration, discovered that moral corruption has penetrated through the blood and marrow of humanity from generation to generation. In this fearful discovery Moses and Sophocles meet one another. But a thousand little moralists smile over this theory of the curse, and find, forsooth, that such a doctrine is against morality, though founded on a thousand agonies and griefs of profound and faithful souls.

But this pretended morality does not trouble the moral chiefs of the world. In the depths of their ethical life-spirit they listen to the slightest footsteps of seduction in the house of Adam, in humanity. They gauge the power of the ethical antipathies which counteract their prayers, and vows, and godly deeds. But in this survey they arrive at the disclosure of a vast relation, since the spirit of divine revelation co-operates with their own foreboding. They announce the fact, that evil in the human world has not merely sprung up in human hearts; there are other stranger, stronger agencies of evil in this region of the universe; there is a devil.¹

¹ Schleiermacher, in his *Glaubenslehre*, i. 219, believes that the doctrine of the agency of the devil may be deduced from a defective knowledge of sin, in contradiction of the opinion that it owes its origin to the profoundest knowledge of evil. But he has seldom reasoned more weakly than when he begins to argue against this doctrine (p. 209). The sophistry and worthlessness of most of his arguments directly appear when we put them to the proof and apply them to the moral relations of men.

The doctrine of the devil proceeds, therefore, from a prophetic and profound ethical knowledge of the world. It might be said that the doctrine of evil demons unfolds itself from the demoniacal depths of ethical foreboding. But it is unfolded with the development of the manifestation of ethical life in humanity ; and those points which may be regarded as articulations in the development of this doctrine coincide with critical moments in the history of the human race. But those who look upon this doctrine as a representation derived from Parsism, and engrafted on the Hebrew faith, have not discerned the difference, wide asunder as the poles, between the idea of an evil God and of a fallen created spirit. The evil God is lord over the substance of half the world—indeed, the proper materiality of the whole world belongs to him, and the good God is scarcely able to overpower him. The fallen evil spirit, on the contrary, as he makes his appearance in the book of Job, is a poor Satan, who cannot call an atom of the material world his own ; who everywhere can only do just so much as power is granted him for by God, whose supremacy controls him, and who turns all his projects to everlasting confusion. How can any one confound the idea of Ahriman with that of Satan—the idea of the wicked one, in whom evil is one with sin—with that idea in which evil is the punishment of sin, its annihilation through substantial life ?

Attempts, indeed, have been made to prove that the idea of Satan involves contradictions ; but the observations in support of this view have been very wide of the mark—they apply to the conception of Ahriman, not to that of Satan. It is certainly inadmissible that evil can be absolutely identical with a substantial Being, that such an one can become Evil personified, or that ‘persevering wickedness should be able to exist with the most distinguished insight.’ But whence has the theologian learnt that ‘the most distinguished insight’ is attributed to the devil in the Bible ? Does not true insight presuppose a harmony with the moral order of the world ? Thus insight makes its appearance in the Bible. The theologian is unfortunate in his appeal to it ; for all insight is denied to the devil by the Bible. He comes forward, indeed, as a great genius, equipped

For example, the first argument asserts that only such motives can be given for the fall of good angels as perhaps pride and envy, which presuppose such a fall. This amounts to saying that the fall of a pure spiritual being is altogether inconceivable. His second argument caricatures the biblical doctrine of the devil : we shall return to this in the sequel. Further, human evil must be identical with possession ; besides, the doctrine of Satan must declare that he lost his understanding by the perversion of his will. And ‘how is it to be conceived that some angels have sinned and others have not ?’ If we apply this argument to human relations, we shall find that it equally amounts to nothing. Is it necessary to enter on the proof of this ? The exegesis of biblical passages which relate to the doctrine of the devil is not much better, in the aforesaid demonstration, than the philosophical discussion of the question. Besides, the leading assumption is false, that Christ and His apostles only made use of this representation because it was in vogue among the people. How could the popular representation necessitate our Lord to mark such a great mysterious experience of His life as that given in the history of the temptation, as a temptation of Satan ? [Renan (*Vie de Jésus*, p. 41) adduces it as an instance in which Jesus was not more enlightened than His countrymen, that ‘il croyait au diable, qu'il envisageait comme une sorte de génie du mal.’—Ed.]

with a power of understanding refined to superlative craftiness ; but his demoniacal cunning appears as moral stupidity, and on all points in which he manœuvred against humanity he is decidedly foiled by the action of the divine insight, especially in the history of the fall, in the trial of Job, and in the history of Jesus. As soon as the theologian has freed himself from confounding Parsism with the pure biblical theology, he will find that no conception is more firmly established than that of the devil. We proceed from this point, that, even before the fall of man, a fall had taken place in a spiritual sphere of the world. A host of spirits, belonging to the train and retinue of a powerful spirit of their own kind, fell with him into sin, and apostatized from God. There is nothing contradictory in this fact. The fall of men proves the possibility of the fall of other spirits. But the manner in which great and highly gifted men have fallen most deeply, and even within the life of humanity have been able to exhibit the demoniacal in evil, throws light on the supposition, that in that pre-human disorder in the spirit-world the greatness in the fall of their chief bore some proportion to the original greatness of his nature. But though the notion of such a region of pre-human fallen spirits cannot be impugned, yet it may seem difficult, not to say monstrous, to admit an agency of these spirits on the human world. The representation, that in ancient times a familiar colloquial intercourse existed between men and devils, has always given offence. How should Satan as such be able to come near men ? Here is the proper place for pointing out the significance of the doctrine of the great life-operations in the world, which appear in the antagonism of sympathies and antipathies. Just as the cosmical lights from star to star operate through the wide creation, so, but to a greater degree, do the psychical moods of spirits both good and bad. Thus humanity in its primal innocence had to encounter the action of a fallen spirit-sphere, which depressed the inspiration of its undeveloped ethical life-feeling. The moment of its first trial happened at the moment of such a psychical depressing influence of Satan. Thus the trial became a temptation ; and in the elements of this temptation the natural allurements which in every trial operated on man, became a colloquial address of the spirit of temptation. We saw above how the influences of pure spirits can become plastic in the human soul —how they create in its inward tuition an appearance, a language, a conversation. The same holds good of the powerful operations of Satan. The more sensitive, tender, and vigorous a man feels, so much the more every evil influence gains over him, as soon as he wavers in his moral standing, a plastic distinctness which it had from the first in its inner nature, and becomes an appearance, or a discourse, or, in fact, a speaking appearance.

The action of the fallen spirit-world on the first human world may be easily explained, even though it be considered as the action of an extra-mundane sphere. But if it be supposed that in Satan's kingdom spiritual traces appear of a shattered earthly spirit-king-

dom anterior to man, this hypothesis gains important confirmation from analogous traditions of a physical kind, which send us back to such a shattered pre-human primitive world. We are led by these ruins, in their relation to the doctrine of Satan, to the supposition that that sphere of colossal serpents, lizards, and other monstrous amphibia had been formed round the centre of an ethically free giant-spirit and his associates, and that this spirit constituted the spiritually conscious centre of his insular world, in the same sense as man, in the present organic form of the earth, exists as the life-principle comprehending and glorifying all organisms in conscious spirit-life. According to this construction of that giant-world in which the amphibious type predominated, we understand why the spiritual chief of that sphere after his fall is designated as the Dragon.

According to this, in demonology the complement of the physical ruins would appear, quite naturally, in a parallel of ethical ruins. In this connection Satan may be contemplated as the ethical giant-fossil from the age of the pre-human earth-formation. The creation of the human earth unfolded itself out of the judgment that preceded on the demon-earth. But though that demon-earth has been judged and set aside by the formation of the human earth, yet as smothered Chaos it has in various ways an influence on the tone of the present world's history. From time to time the tones of that insular antiquity break forth. The billows again roar, and mingle sea and land, and miasmata are exhaled from the swamps. In particular jnices of nature the traces appear of the potencies of that far-gone age—poisons, which are, so to speak, the spirit-sounds of that buried nature, which reverberate in the present.¹ The amphibia exhibit the animal type which was predominant in the kingdom of that fallen spirit-chief ; and the serpent, in the forms under which it has come forth in the new earth-sphere, has become the symbol of his nature and agency. It could formerly pass through the air in various shapes, winged as a dragon ; but under the present economy it is sentenced to crawl on its belly, and to eat the dust. Its existence, which was prominent in the former economy, and stood near the demon-chief of the globe, is now degraded to the lowest dust compared with that of the higher animals ; and the regions in which the spirits of that condemned original population of the earth have taken their residence, are the wastes, the deserts, and stormy winds, by which the effects of their former power are symbolized. But these fallen spirits themselves have, by their sympathetic influence on young humanity, converted the trial which it had to stand, into a dangerous temptation which it has not withstood. Since that time, the continued action and movement of their tones in the earthly world form the special centre of gravity and demoniacal depth of all evil

¹ See K. Snell, *Philosophische Betrachtungen der Natur*, the Essay on the occurrence and significance of poisons in nature, p. 23, especially pp. 36-48. ‘Prussic acid gives us a representation of a state of matter which we must call living death, and of which, without it, we could form no conception. This state was certainly at one time general and predominant in nature.’

on the earth. On this account, according to the view of all God's moral heroes in holy writ, the whole kingdom of sin appears as a kingdom of Satan.

We must not overlook the fact, that the actual effects which proceed from the region of these demons are symbolically conceived and represented in a twofold way. First of all, they are made use of with poetic liveliness to describe all evil. On the one hand, evil is called simply devilish, because human evil has been called forth by devilish evil, though evil is as human as it is devilish, and throughout creaturely, in the definite mood of a fallen creature, or rather the positively worthless and pernicious which makes man a sinner, and the demon a devil. It is also called 'devilish,' as being the most concrete and powerful expression to designate evil. On the other hand, the devilish is called evil, as if Satan were the ideal chief of evil, identical with evil, although he is only in a historical sense the first, most powerful chief of evil. But Satan is designated simply as the evil one, because the religious feeling takes cognizance only of the destructive ethical side of his life, and stands in no immediate relation to his nature-side. This symbolic in its application to the doctrine of Satan should be thoroughly understood, lest, without intending it, we should make an Ahriman of Satan.

The kingdom of Satan naturally stands in constant antagonism to the kingdom of God. It is developed till the completion of its judgment, confronting the kingdom of light. The manifestations of salvation and of the divine life on earth are encountered by the outbreaks and disclosures of the powers of darkness. They come forward in manifold masks, adapted to the circumstances of the times. But the ethical spirit of humanity ever casts a penetrating glance through all disguises, and detects and rejects the old enemy who is a murderer from the beginning. The first man learnt, not in his sin, but in his repentance, that a crafty demoniacal power had ruined him by its temptation. In the last times of the present course of the world, the true Church, in conflict with 'the beast out of the sea,' and with 'the beast out of the earth' which 'had two horns like a lamb,' will discern that it is the dragon who speaks through all the beasts (Rev. xiii.) Christ in the wilderness, after His baptism, had to encounter a great critical temptation; He discerned the tempter behind the temptation.

NOTE.

It must here be stated in most explicit terms, that we carefully distinguish between the doctrine of the devil in itself and the view just given, according to which the fall of the devil is regarded as the fall of the moral central being of the pre-Adamite earth. We are desirous not to make this doctrine dependent, in its general form, in the slightest degree on our hypothesis. But it will not escape the unprejudiced reader how very much this hypothesis is fitted to bring about a harmonious religious view of earthly-cosmical relations. Jacob Böhme, in his visionary speculation, seems to have

gained an image of this view, but his image was necessarily obscured and distorted by the influence of his gnostic principles. Thus much he saw, that in the present form of the world, a conflict of two forms of the world appeared, and that particularly 'Man is and signifies that other host which God created instead of Lucifer's host expelled from Lucifer's place.'¹ But in this Adam three principles were from the first active—'the kingdom of hell, the kingdom of this world, and the kingdom of paradise,' although originally his life commenced in the paradisaical principle. The passage, Gen. i. 2, is explained by the adherents of Böhmk's system in the same way, since it is regarded as a description of the ruined world of Lucifer. But that desolation and void may be regarded as the consecrated fermentation of the world in process of formation, over the dark depths of which the Spirit of God moved with creative energy. If we wished to find the contrast between the purely demoniacal and the Adamic earth in the contrast of the insular and continental type, that pre-Adamite world-history, with its fall of the spirits, would come in between the second and third day's work of creation, Gen. i. 8, 9.

SECTION VII.

THE SPIRITUAL REST AND SPIRITUAL LABOUR OF CHRIST IN THE WILDERNESS—THE TEMPTATION.

(Matt. iv.; Mark i.; Luke iv.)

The words of the Evangelist (Matt. iv. 1), 'Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil,' have been looked upon by modern criticism as a dark hieroglyphic. But they are explained by the simple law, that every ethical nature, according to the measure of its power and the destiny operating in this power, must maintain on earth the conflict with the powers of darkness, in order to gain influence for humanity, and to become a decided reality. The facts of experience correspond to this law, that to every first inspiration of such a power the tempter unawares stands opposite, as if one power had called forth the other from the darkness of the world to the battle-field. In this manner the divine government of the world fulfils its work. By the uncovering of evil in the course of events, over against the manifestations of good, judgment is executed on the absolute nothingness and baseness of evil. Thus there was a world-historical, and indeed a divine reason, why Christ should be led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil. His spiritual rest was exchanged for a great and severe spiritual task in the wilderness: it had for its sequel a temptation which was consummated in a mysterious historical act. But after the victory over the temptation, the spiritual festivity reappeared with fresh and steady splendour.

In the Jordan the bright side of sinful humanity had blessed the

¹ Bauer, *die christliche Gnosis*, p. 591.

Lord ; in the wilderness He was obliged to endure the action of its dark side,—the tempting operation of its curse.

If we are informed that the Spirit led the Lord into the wilderness after His God-man consciousness had been festively filled with that divine joy of His inner life, yet we at the same time receive the intimation that the Lord could not immediately enter with these riches of His heart into the congregation of His people, who formed the contrast to the wilderness.

We might indeed look on the forty days which Jesus spent in the wilderness, first of all, as the celebration of the disclosed fulness of His inner glory. He needed to be a long time alone with God, in order to spread before Him the great revelation which had now been completed, to meditate upon it with Him, and to seal it in the quiet consecration of His life.

This celebration was at all events the beginning, the key-note, and aim of His sojourn in solitude. It was the holy mysterious poetry of the completed unfolding of all Heaven's fulness in the heart of humanity, the beautiful blooming time of roses in the soul of the God-man, the still hour of the holy spring night of the New Covenant on which the nightingale of the world sang its first song to its God. But why call this glorious celebration in solitude, so significantly, the temptation in the wilderness ?

Christ, in the celebration of his Spirit-life, could not turn away from humanity. He could not retain this fulness of life as booty for Himself. It belonged to the nature of this inner glory that He regarded it as God's mission to the world—as Heaven's great benediction—as the salvation of the world. The infinite divine joy with which His heart now throbbed, was at the same time unbounded love of man ; and thus it became an indescribably strong impulse to communicate Himself to the world, and especially to the people of Israel. The impulse of His life was to enter without delay into the midst of the congregation of Israel. And the people called Him. They called Him by all the yearnings of their expectations, by all the thoughts and images of their ideal of the Messiah. The world with all its ideals called Him. But the ideals that called Him were poisoned by the revelry and intoxication of humanity. The Messianic image of a sinful world—a clever, but in all points distorted caricature—as the confused, dim, mocking image of a chaotically agitated and serpent-like wily prince of this world—contradicted the pure image of God in the Messianic consciousness of Christ. Therefore, no sooner had He after His baptism turned Himself in Spirit to the world, with the greeting of His love, than He received a counter-greeting in a loud siren-song of all the distorted intoxicated world-ideals. He could not advance a step among His people without meeting the caricatured image of the chief of men ; without coming upon false assumptions, false words, interpretations and fictions of a false chiliasm perverting the history of the world in a thousand forms, and of a fanatical and carnal idealistic world-vertigo.

The contrariety of Christ's Messianic kingdom to the Messianic

ideal of the Jews has often been so explained as if Christ wished to establish a merely spiritual kingdom of heaven—as if He had not inserted in His work the tendency to plant the ideal life, and to advance it to its completion in the actual appearance, and by His redemption really to transform the world. But this ‘anti-judaical’ spiritualism falls itself into the most palpable error, even while intending to correct the error of the Jews. It contradicts the Messianic image of the prophets, who, agreeably to the nature of the case, combine in one view the inner and outer kingdom of heaven ; it equally contradicts the Christian doctrine of that transformation of the world which is to be completed at the resurrection ; and lastly, it contradicts the most explicit declarations and promises of Christ Himself, who points to His second advent as the transformation of the world. This view also contradicts every well-grounded theory of the world. It belongs to the dualism which splits the world into two halves—so that ideas must form spectres without corporeity, and matters of fact mere animal phenomena without spiritual life. In truth, this spiritualism generally falls back into that chiliasm which it professes to shun. For it must always grant or desire some kind of transformation of the world, and for that purpose it requires both principles and organs. But as it has rejected that transformation by the Spirit and life of Christ, it forms for itself other principles unchristian and antichristian, which are to make up for or to supplement Christian ones, and must seek in false messiahs for the organs of the world’s transformation. But for this dualism Christ has given no warrant whatever by His declaration, ‘ My kingdom is not of this world.’ These words rather express the fact, that with the appearance of His kingdom, this world vanishes, and the future becomes manifest. The very fact that He speaks of His kingdom shows that He has founded not merely a school, or a congregation, or a church, but a morally organized community, completing itself in ideal universality. *The* kingdom is *His* kingdom. But He will surrender it into the hands of the Father ; therefore Christ has never given up the expectation that His Messianic kingdom will be a kingdom of outward visibility. As the festival of Easter arises out of Good Friday, so His new world arises from the depths of world-renunciation—His kingdom of glory from His kingdom of the cross. But the expectation that it must begin as an outward kingdom, and therefore outward in its constitution, without being founded in God and in the life of the Spirit,—as a secular kingdom brought into existence by means of craft and force, and so an anticipatory counterfeit of the true kingdom, in which every appearance must proceed from the fulness of the Spirit,—this expectation Christ could never have cherished ; for it was the very temptation He combated in the wilderness, and truly a temptation of Satan.

The kingdom of darkness can never realize on earth its chaotic tendencies in their naked, wild form. The destruction of human life, to a large world-historical extent, can be effected only when the

spirit of the ethical chaos succeeds in wearing the mask of a transformed cosmos. Only in delusive social forms, political and hierarchical, but especially Messianic and chiliastic, can the ‘nameless beast’ win for itself, and maintain for a while, a great appearance. The history of evil on the earth proves this. It often appears in chiliastic, often in hierarchical forms ; but in the one case the chiliiasm is headed by a hierarchical power, in the other case the hierarchy is animated by the intoxication of chiliasm. The hierarchy that crucified Christ was in reality Jewish chiliiasm throughout. In His time it was concentrated in the falsified ideal of the Messiah. Its special sympathetic power was its connection with all carnal, extravagant idealizing (*Idealisterei*)—with all the fantastic, wild fanaticisms in the world. But its deepest principle was the chief of the demoniacal chaos, who readily disguised himself as an angel of light. When the spirit of a people is hostilely excited in an antichristian tendency against the spirit of Christ and the spirit of the true transformation of the world, in this excitement it necessarily forms a sympathetic union with the spirit of the world in its ungodly tendency. In this sympathy its own tendency coincides with all the tendencies of satanic power ; and as this is the mightiest power of the whole community, so it becomes its animating principle. In truth, demoniacal evil can realize its ideal only in forms of light which allow the inward mockery to be seen through them ;—only in forms of the Holy through which may be seen the sneer of the internal contradiction ;—only in a false scenery of the transformed world, through which the lightnings of the ancient chaos flash in all directions. The Jewish expectation of the Messiah had its ideal realized in the horrible scenes of the Jewish war.

This expectation met the Lord in His way, as soon as he wished to turn to the people. It was the assumption that He must found His kingdom on an ungodly carnal mind, on unspirituality and internal corruption, on craft and force, which always accompany fanatical idealism among mankind. In His pure sympathy for humanity, He felt the drawing of this intense perverted longing in the world. But no sooner did He feel this influence than it excited a powerful repulsion in the Holy Spirit with which He was filled. This repulsion drove Him into the wilderness. That sympathetic influence opposed Him like a wall. The spirit of temptation encountered Him all the way between Jordan and Jerusalem. Christ, with His Messianic consciousness, sought a sure entrance among His people, and seemed to find none. How could He escape being grievously misunderstood by the world, when He appeared in it as the Messiah, the Son of God ? The more He was impelled by the love of mankind to hold intercourse with His people, so much the more a holy shyness towards men drove Him into the wilderness. He could not directly manifest to men the Sun of God’s fulness which glowed in His heart, without dazzling their weak eyes. An immediate animated disclosure of His inmost soul would have been for them the final judgment. And how could He expose the glorious

mystery of His soul to the unutterable profanation which must ensue, if He was willing to disclose His consciousness directly to the people and trust Himself to the world? It was the curse of the world, that the splendour of His inmost soul, unless it were veiled, must destroy the world. He was obliged to secure His sanctuary in the wilderness from the profanation of the temple-goers, His kingly dignity from the insults of the rulers, His Messiahship from the prevalent Messianic delusions, and His love of men from men. Amidst these embarrassments, He concealed Himself in the depths of the desert. He lived among the wild beasts. They alarmed not the Prince of men, and were less dangerous to Him than men. He wandered about, and could not leave the wilderness, because the Spirit always drove Him back into solitude as often as His heart turned towards men; and then temptation again assailed Him with the alluring sympathy of the world. Thus He was withdrawn from the world for forty days. He had taken refuge in concealment, as if in death, from the siren's song of the world's ideal. He tasted no food during this period of intense mental conflict. His sojourn in the wilderness forms an appalling spectacle,—the spectacle of a man prostrated in the deepest sorrow, and harassed with the severest conflict.

And yet, as we have already intimated, it was not exclusively this mental conflict, involving the interests of humanity, which detained Him in the wilderness. Strongly as the love of man, on the one hand, attracted Him, not less strongly, on the other hand, was He attracted by the love of God. The attraction of the one prepared for Him unspeakable sorrow, that of the latter inexpressible joy. There is a blessedness which is plunged in sadness—a delicate, trembling joy, a solemn festival of the soul in which all the joys of heaven meet and salute all the sufferings of humanity. In this state of feeling we find our Lord. He turned Himself to the Father. In the Father's bosom He concealed His kingly sense of God—His holy horror at the drunken idealizing of the world. If His sorrow caused Him to fast, still more was this effect produced by the peace of this super-mundane retirement, in which He could spend forty days as one holy festival in the presence of His Father. This preponderance of the rest of God over human labour in His spirit—this glorification of His sorrow in His blessedness, of His love of men in His love of God, was just the preponderance of His freedom over the sympathies of His life, which resulted in His victory. This peculiar state of mind serves to explain the long fasting of Christ.

Even in the first days of His fasting, criticism begins to be voracious while it accompanies Him with its meagre reflections. Its doubts cannot disturb us. Christ's fasting was not legal, nor a result of enactment. He might have lived, like John, on locusts and wild honey without essentially breaking His fast.¹ But we can

¹ Of John the Baptist Christ says (Matt. xi. 18) he came neither eating nor drinking, although he lived on locusts and wild honey, the bread of the wilderness. [Meyer, in his thorough, unflinching way, says the fasting here 'is to be understood *absolutely*', and refers to the convincing passages, Exod. xxxiv. 28, and 1 Kings xix. 8.—Ed.]

find no difficulty if we take the fasting of Christ in the strictest sense. Often deep thinkers,¹ contemplative devotees,² sorrowing penitents,³ ecstatic enthusiasts, or persons under morbid excitement,⁴ have fasted for an extraordinary length of time. But Christ is also in this respect the Prince of men, who in the highest heroic measure comprehends the particular possibilities of this class. In Him the power of the deepest contemplation co-operated with the power of the deepest sorrow, and these with the highest inspiration, in order to sustain a disposition so free from wants and so super-mundane, and which was perfected by means of the highest sympathy which His soul now felt for the entire morbid state of His generation. In truth, His fasting, according to its deepest significance, was the specific, redeeming counteraction against the malady of the world, as far as it consisted in a mad, false idealizing. To that insane chiliastic idolizing of the world which would fain have deluded and fettered Him, He opposed the counterpoise of His perfected sober-mindedness, of which the outward form appeared in His fasting. It should never be forgotten that Christianity was born into the world with a plenitude of the Spirit, which showed the freest exaltation above nature in the fasting of Christ. And this characteristic it retains through all time. In this heroic sobriety of soul it overcame and rescued the Roman-Grecian world in that wild debauchery which would have been its ruin. And thus, hereafter, the Church by the power of a spirit-like sobriety will overcome the jovial banqueting of those who will be eating, and drinking, and amusing themselves at the end of the world (Matt. xxiv. 38, 39). But what specially supported our Lord during those days in the energy of His life, was the creative vital power which gave Him copious supplies of nourishment and vigour, and refreshed His inmost soul. He lived by depending on the mouth of God, while He retired with ecstasy into His innermost principle of life.⁵

In the great movements of His exalted consciousness, the forty days might pass away as a single day, or an hour. It has been observed,⁶ that in the lives of Moses⁷ and Elijah,⁸ periods of forty days occur as fast-times in critical junctures ; and the narrative of the sojourn of Jesus in the wilderness has brought to mind the forty years' wandering of Israel in the wilderness. Some have made this remark in order to find out traces of fiction in the history ; others, in order to comfort themselves with the thought that the number of forty days is not to be taken too rigidly.⁹ But this rhythmical recurrence of forty days in similar junctures of the Theocracy rather points to a more general mysterious law of life. The forty days' fasting of Moses also forms a contrast to the preceding rebellion of the people, who 'ate, and drank, and rose up to play,'

¹ Spinoza supported himself for several days on four sous.

² Niklaus von der Flüe.

³ Saul, Acts ix. 9.

⁴ See W. Hoffman, *das Leben Jesu*, p. 315. Many examples of this sort have occurred in modern times.

⁵ Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus*, i. 37 (Clark's Tr.) .

⁶ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 450.

⁷ Exod. xxxiv. 28.

⁸ 1 Kings xix. 8.

⁹ Neander, *Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 73 (Bohn).

and showed their preference for a false religion. Elijah in like manner presented a spiritual antagonism to the hankering of his people after the fantastic pleasure of the worship of Baal. The common labour of man is comprised in the cycle of a week, and his spiritual labour in the cycle of a week multiplied into itself, in a period of about seven weeks of labour. The spiritual labour by which Israel, as a people, were obliged to purify themselves for the temperate enjoyment of the glories of Canaan, required forty years. But why should not the theocratic history, the innermost essence of which is poetry, be carried on, like poetry, in rhythmical relations? In Christ's life also, this law of life must be fulfilled, according to which the psychical relations stand in living affinity to the earthly relations of time.

But when the forty days were fulfilled, then he hungered. He became vividly conscious of His destitution. He hungered not only after bread, but also after man, and after living intercourse with the world. This was the moment in which all the tempting He had withstood was concentrated, and at the same time unfolded, in most distinct single temptations; the moment in which the tempter, whose spiritual influence He had up to that time experienced, came before Him in a more defined form. We are able to distinguish exactly these two stadia of the temptation: the secret whispers of the tempting spirit during the forty days, and its final concentration in the three assaults at the close. Matthew has condensed the whole temptation of Christ into those final assaults. Mark has simply noticed the temptation in its duration of forty days. Luke has specified the two constituent parts of the temptation. As soon as we have ascertained the significance of the whole transaction, no real contradictions can be imagined. But we must now endeavour to set in a clear light the distinction between the two forms of the temptation.

During the forty days Christ was tempted in this way, that He was met by the Messianic ideal of Israel in its corrupted chiliastic form, sustained by all the morbid fanatical excitement then existing in the world, and by the powers of darkness. But this temptation was probably not an internal process, as it is often represented in order to explain the history of the temptation.¹ Christ could not in an idle manner brood over the possibilities of sin, or imagine them in darkness by spreading out the allurements of the false ideal of the world before His own spirit. On this supposition, one part of His consciousness would have been the tempter, and the other the conqueror.² Such a self-tempting of the consciousness can hardly be imagined without involving sin.³ The totality of the soul's life will

¹ 'Transient illusions' (*Fluchtige Vorspiegelungen*) the temptations of Jesus, according to this view, are called by Fleck (*die Vertheidigung des Christenthums*, p. 225).

² Particularly according to the representation of this transaction by Weisse (*die evangelische Geschichte*, ii. 21).

³ [¹ I could as soon accept the worst statements of the most degraded form of Arian creed, as believe that this temptation arose from any internal struggles or solicitations,—I could as soon admit the most repulsive tenet of a dreary Socinianism, as

not allow us to separate the voluntary imagination of the tempting evil from an accompanying movement of evil desire. And apart from this psychological law, another law of life forbids our regarding the temptation of Christ as a fact of His consciousness isolated from His people's life. It belongs to the order and soundness of the inner life to indulge in no idle brooding anticipations of the future. The soul can and should anticipate the outward experience, but only in proportion as it comes in contact with the spiritual prognostics of the experience, as the collision with experience begins to fall upon its ear; as therefore it is congruous with a human life which must be always prepared and led through the inward to the outward, and with its essential superiority to time. But if beyond this necessity it indulges in arbitrary anticipations, it gets out of its historical rhythm. This arbitrary exercise of the imagination would be in itself sinful, even should there be nothing sinful in the nature of its imaginings. But Christ could not disturb the order of His life in a morbid manner. His battle with the evil one was, therefore, not the result of a fiction. It was a genuine historical collision with him, though a spiritual one. The whole soul of Christ stood firm in the absolute rejection of the temptation, which was not in the least degree the offspring of His own fancy. But not the less was His soul moved and agitated by temptation, in consequence of the sympathy which bound Him closely to His own people and to mankind. In the element of this sympathy He beheld all the images of temptation standing clearly before Him—He heard all the tones of its allurements. Christ's living impulse to manifest Himself to His people placed Him incessantly opposite to temptation, which was continually meeting Him in new forms. The repulsion with which He continually put it away from Him was His victory.

In consequence of this repulsion, Christ must always have remained in the wilderness, unless in some particular moments of His conflict the possibility had not been developed and displayed to Him of entering among the people, and thus fulfilling the mission of His life. The struggle of Christ with temptation was at the same time to secure and determine the complete carrying out of His calling in all its distinguishing traits. And since, on the one hand, in the life of His free love the necessity of manifesting Himself to the people moved Him, and, on the other hand, He felt the necessity of concealing and withdrawing Himself from the people, the plan of His Messianic ministry required to be clearly and distinctly unfolded under the painful reciprocal action of this apparent contradiction. At the end of His conflict He had a fully developed solution of the difficult problem, how He could surrender Himself as the true Messiah to the people, who were carried away by a false Messianic image.

deem that it was enhanced by any self-engendered enticements, or hold that it was aught else than the assault of a desperate and demoniacal malice from without, that recognized in the nature of man a possibility of falling, and that thus far consistently, though impiously, dared even in the person of the Son of man to make proof of its hitherto resistless energies.'—Ellicott's *Hist. Lect.*, p. 111.—ED.]

The completion of this determination of His calling coincided with the completion of His victory over temptation, and therefore with the completion of the festal repose of His Spirit.

But it would be contrary to all general and individual experience if we were disposed to admit that the temptation of Christ was ended and completed in a merely spiritual and ideal form. Actual fact shows us that the moral conflicts of man cannot possibly remain spiritualist combats. The tempting opportunity always meets the susceptible disposition, and converts the ideal conflict into a historical one.¹ The solemnity of the divine superintendence demands it, and the thoughtfulness of life and the truth of victory. How many a flaming inspiration of idealist valour has become to 'rude reality a prey!' The victory of Christ over the tempter would not have been perfectly certain if the latter had not appeared to Him in historic reality.

But how did he appear to Christ?² We need not explain at length that Satan could not become a man, and assume flesh and blood, like the Son of God. Such a supposition would expose any one to the charge of Manicheism; it would be condemned for its dualism. But if it were imagined that Satan showed himself to the Lord in a spectral appearance, it can hardly be granted that Christ would let Himself be disposed of by such a spectre of hell on the soil of this earth's reality, and be led through the world in all directions.³ Nothing is gained, if it is attempted to render the supposition easier, by supposing that Satan transformed himself into an angel of light; for never could he appear more detestable and repulsive in Christ's eyes than under this mask. It is perfectly unchristological to regard these temptations as a series of juggling tricks by the arch-sorcerer, since it supposes that he transported the Lord from one scene of temptation to another.⁴ Even the pious popular feeling in the legends, which represent the tricks of jugglers as failing in the eyes of innocent children and virtuous maidens, goes beyond this mode of viewing things, which makes the eye of Christ dependent on the illusions of the Prince of Lies. Indeed, if we wished to deal seriously with this supposed illusion, it might be difficult to distinguish it from the beginning of an internal infatuation.

The tempter did not approach the Lord with juggling tricks, but in the dangerous power of historical circumstances. The kingdom of Satan was represented by the false tendency of the kingdom of this world, and this lastly by the perverted tendency of the Jewish hierarchy. But that the Jewish hierarchy about this time were in quest of a Messiah according to their ideal, may easily be proved.

¹ [This view seems to receive confirmation especially from our Lord's own experience in His last trial, when He had first to endure the ideal and spiritual conflict alone in the garden, and then the actual historical sufferings and death.—ED.]

² Ebrard, in his *Gospel History*, admits a visible appearance of Satan, without any further explanation.

³ See Ullmann, *The Sinlessness of Jesus*, p. 160 (Clark's Tr., 2nd ed.).

⁴ Olshausen, *Commentary on the New Testament*, i. 167 (Clark's Tr.) Krabbe, *Vorlesungen über das Leben Jesu*, p. 172.

That deputation which the hierarchy sent from Jerusalem to Jordan, for the purpose of obtaining from the Baptist an explanation respecting his own character, must have returned to Jerusalem, according to the dates furnished by the Evangelists, about the time when Christ's forty days' sojourn had really expired. From the account of the Evangelist John (i. 28, 29), it is quite evident that Jesus came back from the solitude of the wilderness just one day after the return of this deputation from Jordan. Now, the Baptist had declared to them in the most explicit terms that he himself was not the Messiah, but at the same time most distinctly announced that the Messiah was come among them without their knowing Him. From a sense of his theocratic duty, he could not content himself on such a subject with simple intimations. If he pointed out the Messiah to his disciples, much more would he mark Him out to the rulers of His people, whatever might be the consequences. If, then, the deputation came to him precisely at the time in which he had recognized the person of the Messiah, he would regard it as an intimation from the Lord to direct the attention of the deputation away from himself to the acknowledged Messiah. If he could not direct them to His place of sojourn in the desert, yet he could so exactly describe His personal appearance, that it would be easy for the deputation to find Him on their way home. But, at all events, it would be a very false conception of this politically excited hierarchy, to suppose that they would take home so quietly the announcement from the lips of the Baptist, that the Messiah was in their midst, without making any further inquiries on the matter of fact. The Jewish hierarchy, filled with deep rancour against the Romans, longed for a political Messiah. As to the existence of this longing, we must not be misled by the hypocrisy with which they delivered up the true Messiah to the Romans, professing the highest devotedness to the Emperor; it is sufficiently confirmed by the later Jewish history. These men therefore left the Baptist under the excitement of this longing, and pursued the traces of the Messiah; and all the more readily they would pass near His retreat on their way home, if, according to traditional accounts, He was sojourning in the wilderness near Jericho. It might not be difficult for them to find out the Man they were so anxious to see, since His inner conflicts were now ended, and His course of life or entrance into the world was now clearly marked out; He was therefore on the point of leaving the wilderness on His return to the Baptist. But if they found Him, they would accost Him with all the parade and impatience of their Messianic expectations. They would present Him with a Messianic programme diametrically opposite in all essential points to that which had been formed in His own mind.¹

¹ That the view of the history of the temptation as a historical fact in a narrower sense has already existed in Rationalist forms (see Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, p. 442), and that it is marked as antiquated in its unmotived outward form, cannot prevent us from presenting it in a new form and on a fresh foundation. We have in this view not the least interest to settle the demonology, but we shall necessarily be led to it by the

The same pure divine Prince of spirits who treated Peter as a Satan when he wanted to dissuade from the path that led to the cross, as ordained by His Father—who regarded the ripened thoughts of treachery in Judas as an inspiration of Satan (John xiv. 30)—and, lastly, who beheld in His own death on the cross a judgment on the prince of this world—must have regarded this historical temptation on the part of the Sanhedrim as the culmination and historic completion of that sympathetic temptation of Satan with which He had wrestled in the wilderness.

The hierarchs, accustomed to a life of luxury, must have been astonished beyond measure, when they discovered the supposed instrument of their designs, the great Prince of the world, in the form of a fasting, hungry hermit. The oriental pomp, we might say, the poetry of courtiers, may be detected in the words, ‘If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.’ As little as John the Baptist could have thought of a literal transformation of stones when he said, ‘God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham,’ so little could the voice of temptation have required here, in a literal sense, that the Lord should change stones into bread. Such a requirement could have been no temptation for Him. In the soul of Christ least of all could the thought arise, of using His miraculous power in so fantastic a manner. Indeed we can hardly impute such an expectation even to the Jewish hierarchs. It is true, they expected a Messiah whose rule should quickly change the desert into a blooming champaign;¹ but in what manner, was a matter of indifference to them. If He had exhibited Himself decidedly in their sense as the Son of God, the wilderness would very soon, by His magical power over spirits, have become an Israelitish camp-scene, in which would have flowed a superabundance of all earthly enjoyments. But still more directly must He have been able, in their opinion, to change the wilderness into a region of delight by the magic art of a world-transforming culture. This, indeed, was the chief element of the temptation, that He should at once begin the desired transformation of the world for appeasing His own hunger, and for the celebration of the commencing worldly pleasure with the transformation of the wilderness in which they and He were then standing.² But this proposal was a real temptation for Him, since the actual transformation of the world lay within the scope of His ministry, and since the infinite patience of His spirit was required to wait for that manifestation of the glorious fulness of life which always floated before Him as the slow, late bloom and fruit of all the activity of His spirit. Thousands suffer themselves to be misled by this first speech of the tempter to a deceptive false glorification of the world, colouring and covering the

motives assigned. Those tempting hierarchs form only the historic heads of the whole transaction, and the organs of a temptation which in its deepest ground and connection we regard as altogether satanic.

¹ Compare Isa. xxxv. 1.

² The fantastic images of abundance in which Jewish tradition depicts the transformation of the world at its close are well known.

curse of the wilderness. Thus oftentimes, by popular delusion, by robbery, by the subversion of social order, by enormous loans and deceptions of all kinds, the deserts are made glad, and the stones are turned into bread. We detect traces of this sorcery in the chiliastic Zion of the Munster Anabaptists, in Wallenstein's camp, as well as in many other historical caricatures of the world's transformation. Still the tempter sings this old song,¹ and his magic tones are just now sounding again through the world with a marvellous power of delusion. Christ, therefore, in virtue of that great sympathy with which He, as Prince of men, felt the pulse of humanity, heard in the address of the tempter the call of all carnal idealizing of hunger, want, and destitution in the world, the lamentation of all false mendicity, the fawning petitions of all chiliast worldlings, the extravagant requirements of all hypocritical and superficial philanthropists: 'O command that these stones be made bread!' The sympathetic rush of all morbid human longings after the enchanted land of an unjust and measureless abundance, and a glory of the flesh overpowering the spirit, broke out in this temptation against His heart, and made Him shudder, since he felt most deeply all the misery of the world—all the glow of its hope, and all the glory of its prospects. Thus He was tempted to create an abundance with the powers of His divine-human life, in contravention of the divine order, and in a self-willed magical manner. But before this delirious excitement He veiled His unique divine-human consciousness. He answered it with a divine word, which had formerly supported the confidence of pious human hearts during their sufferings in the wilderness: 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.'² In the name of humanity itself, of necessitous man, He rejected the assumption that man cannot realize the ideal of his spirit unless he is living in the splendour of outward abundance. He asserted to the tempter, the dignity of the personality by which man is elevated above the requirement of mere animal existence. Man lives not by bread alone; but the breath of life from the mouth of God gives him his life in the most special sense.

By His victory over the first temptation Christ laid the foundation for the genuine transformation of the world, and for the establishment of a real abundance upon earth in the blessing of His Spirit. The two miraculous feedings of the people in the wilderness, which He performed at a later period, would represent, as by a wonderful prelude, this transformation of the earth into the super-abundance of heaven.

Now began the second temptation. Satan led the Lord to Jerusalem, placed Him on a pinnacle, and said to Him, 'If Thou be

¹ Göthe has in a masterly manner represented this temptation of Mephistopheles in his Faust, Second Part.

² The expression, *ἐπὶ παντὶ βήματι*, is, according to the words in Deut. viii. 3, 'every-thing that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord,' referable to every creative word from the mouth of God—every vital operation.

the Son of God, cast Thyself down ; for it is written, He shall give His angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.'¹ If Christ had really in an outward sense stood on a pinnacle of the temple,² Satan would hardly have made the proposal to throw Himself down literally. At least this suggestion would not have been to Him a temptation—a psychical shock. But the actual temptation must have really agitated Him. Probably He was transported in a figurative sense to the summit of the temple-pinnacle by the ostentatious offers of the deputies of the Sanhedrim. No doubt the most flattering prospects awaited His recognition by the Sanhedrim. The most solemn assurances were given. As the prophetic and priestly King, He saw Himself already placed on the summit of the temple. Thence He was to make His entry into Jerusalem with the recognition of the priests. But this mode of manifestation to Israel appeared to Him as a fatal death-leap. It is true the plea was urged, that, according to the word of God, there could be no danger for the Lord's Anointed ; He would be borne by angels, and glide over all obstructions. But Christ foiled the tempter with the words, ‘Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.’³ Thus He opposed a definite word of Scripture, in its true scope, to the false exposition of an indefinite and obscure one. Thou shalt not attempt to draw God into the way of thy self-will, thy pride, or thy enthusiasm. He will not allow Himself to be drawn by thee into a sinful interest ; much rather would He let thee fall and drop. If thou wilt tempt Him, the attempt will become a dangerous temptation for thyself. This is the meaning of the command which the Lord held as a shield before His breast, in order to intercept the second dart of the tempter. He rendered the Old Testament precept more pointed, without altering the meaning, by substituting the singular *thou* for the plural *ye*. He thus at the same time brought it home to the tempter, that he tempted God when he tempted Christ. It appeared, therefore, to the Lord a monstrous, fatal venture to trust Himself to the deputies of the Sanhedrim, and to give Himself up to the priesthood of His people. Had this been possible, only the corpse of the true Messiah would have fallen from the pinnacle of the temple among the people ; the hierarchy would have made of Him a different character altogether from what He was. Let us imagine ourselves present at the moment when Christ saw the inclination of the fathers of His nation to receive Him according to their notions of the Messiah, with all the allurements of the historical and Israelitish good-will which such an offer must contain,—let us recollect that all the sympathies which tradition, patriotism,

¹ Ps. xci. 11.

² It was no impossibility to stand on the pinnacle of Solomon's porch, and perhaps on other parts of the temple. See De Wette's Erklärung des Evangelium Matt. p. 40. [Meyer, in a valuable note on this expression, inclines to the opinion that it points to the ridge of the στοὰ βασιλικῆ, on the south side of the temple. For the giddy height of this altitude, see Josephus, Antiq. xv. 11, 5.—Ed.]

³ Deut. vi. 16.

and piety form in the world's history must be involved in His temptation to surrender the sanctuary of His inner life to an infatuated foreign power,—and we shall perceive that His heart must have been agitated to its inmost depths when the storm of such influences broke upon Him. How many noble spirits inflamed by patriotic or religious enthusiasm have fallen before the tempter, because they and their vocation have been held in thraldom by criminal, false, historical tendencies, traditions, and authorities! Jesus withstood the temptation in the power of His sober-mindedness, and of that pure fidelity with which He adhered to His Father's ways. His victory laid the foundation for enabling the kingly and priestly people of believers to make Him known as the Messiah to the nation of Israel, and to all the world. In His triumphal entrance into Jerusalem at the last Passover, He allowed the first bloom of that homage to break forth which hereafter is to be rendered by the whole world.

The deputies from Jerusalem, who, probably in the manner we have pointed out, had placed the Lord by their theocratic phrases on a pinnacle of the temple, could easily stand by Him on a mountain height in the wilderness as they made their last attempt to persuade Him.¹ But the mountain on which they placed Him was a mountain from which they could show Him all the kingdoms of the world, and their glory; therefore a 'mountain higher than all other mountains' (Isa. ii. 2)—Mount Zion, according to its spiritual significance, in the last age of the world. The tempter displayed to Him the prospect of the theocratic government of the world. Probably into this disclosure, plots against the Romans were introduced,—at all events unspiritual, ungodly plots, by which their object was to be attained. And Christ was urged to approve of their hierarchical plan for the conquest of the world. But to Him this demand appeared as a temptation to fall down before Satan and worship Him. And so it was in fact. If the hierarchical or political conqueror of the world avails himself of evil means for his supposed good ends, he acts in reality as a vassal of the prince of darkness, and has bowed the knee to him. The demand for an outward bowing of the knee the crafty enemy would not indeed, in the presence of the Lord, have been very ready to make. But the prospect he opened had an infinite power of sympathetic influence on the heart of Jesus. He cast a glance in spirit over his inheritance—the world. Countless hearts were bleeding, the noblest spirits were waiting for Him, the promise of the Father guaranteed Him this inheritance. All the motives of compassion, love, and holy zeal seemed to oblige Him to hasten to leave no means untried, but at any cost to make Himself forthwith Master of the world. At

¹ Tradition has pointed out the mountain Quarantania, situated in the wilderness, near Jericho, as the mountain of the temptation. 'In one of its many ravines Jesus must have kept His fast of forty days.' Winer, *R. W. B.* ii. 810. ['This tradition, as well as the name Quarantania, appear not to be older than the age of the Crusades.' Robinson, i. 568. See, however, Ellicott (*Hist. Lect.* p. 109), who conjectures 'the lonely and unexplored chain of desert mountains, of which Nebo has been thought to form a part.' This was formerly suggested by Michaelis.—ED.]

such a prospect all His feelings for the world must have been aroused and inflamed. But the maxims on which He was to proceed in immediately beginning the conquest of the world, were such as He was obliged to reject. The splendour of the end could in no wise excuse to Him the detestable means of falsehood and unrighteousness. He could not wish to have the beautiful world at the price of homage to Satan. Every representation of the kingdom of God in the world founded on untruthfulness, false appearances, hypocrisy, and force, appeared to Him fraught with most horrible ruin to the world, a most destructive procedure. His wrath against the tempter now flamed high; and with the words, 'Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve,'¹ He drove him from His presence.

By this victory, in which Christ renounced all pretensions to the immediate conquest of the world, He has gained the world in God's sight, and in the depths of His spirit and of His fidelity to God has already begun to take possession of His kingdom. Since He has not sought the government of the world by base expedients, He has been invested with it by the Father. Luke observes, 'that the devil departed from Him for a season.' Though Jesus all through His life was tempted in a general manner, yet He had two great master-temptations to withstand; first, the temptation of all the demon-inspired pleasure and fanaticism in the world, the temptation to self-delusion in egoistic morbid enthusiasm and in intoxicated arrogance; and next, the temptation of all the demoniac dislike and dread in the world, a temptation to faint-heartedness and despair. The second did not immediately make its appearance when the first was over. But after a certain breathing-time, Christ had to fight with Satan's temptations to despair. The instruments of this second temptation were men—the representatives of the Jewish world of spirit, and this circumstance reflects light on the instruments of the first temptation.

The attitude assumed by the hierarchy against Jesus as soon as He appeared, was so hostile, that we can scarcely attribute it solely to His rejection of the rabbinical rules about the Sabbath. It leads us to conjecture, that the determined conflict between the spirit of Christ and the spirit of this hierarchy had already begun in secret when Christ publicly appeared.

If Christ narrated to His disciples the history of His temptation at the beginning of His intercourse with them, we may easily conceive that, in consideration of their weakness, He would avoid placing the heads of the nation as the instruments of Satan in the foreground of His description. Besides, these personages were properly the mere conveyers of a temptation which in its general form He had encountered before their appearance, and which seemed to Him, moreover, in its historical fulfilment, as an act of the element of ungodliness in the world generally, and in hell itself. Hence the symbolic form of the narrative may be explained.

When Jesus had gained His great victory, 'angels came and

¹ Deut. vi. 13.

ministered to Him.' These words express primarily a spiritual and abiding fact. By this victory over the kingdom of darkness, Jesus was authenticated as the Prince of humanity, and humanity, which in Him had now withstood the severest temptations, appeared in fresh splendour. As a consequence of His moral elevation and the authentication He had received, Jesus was now the Prince of pure spirits, and in Him humanity was represented as a kingdom of spirits exalted over the world of angels. This, Jesus experienced in His own mind: heavenly sounds of congratulation greeted Him after the severe conflict. He received impressions from the world of spirits, and the homage of angels, when, by His victory over all sympathy with evil desires in the world, He had restored the full reciprocation with the joy of the pure spirit-world. And especially in this hour of joyous victory was He able to come into the most intimate spiritual intercourse with angels. But His victory over spirits became historically manifest by the entrance into His service of John and Peter, the noblest angels of the New Testament age.

NOTES.

1. The various explanations of the history of the temptation are of very different values. They prove the difficulty of the subject by their manifold contrariety; but most of them contain some elements of truth, which in a living historic view of the transaction appear combined in a higher unity. The temptation especially appears in the grandest manner as an operation of Satan, provided Satan does not appear bodily according to the popular representations, but his operation is conceived as the result of the sympathetic co-operation of the designs of the ungodly spirit of the world with the designs of the kingdom of darkness. We cannot admit that Satan could have captivated the eye of Jesus by the immediate influence of delusive appearances. Meanwhile we must not fail to observe, that the great idealist illusions of the spirit of the world may be considered as juggleries of darkness, the power of which Christ must have experienced mediately, since they have mingled with the noblest aspirations and forebodings of mankind. Hitherto, when the temptation has been explained as an internal occurrence, the objection has arisen, that the essence of the temptation was thus treated as consisting in a free exercise of the imagination of Christ on the possibilities of sin. But this objection is disposed of, when the internal temptation is recognized as an attack of the sympathetic action of the spirit of His nation and of the world on His soul, to which it was necessary for Him to give a decisive repulse. The hypothesis that Christ was tempted by a single deputy of the Sanhedrim, a Pharisee, has been in later times most generally rejected; it had been brought into discredit owing to its rationalistic origin, and the uninteresting manner in which it was propounded and advocated. This does not prevent us from accepting what is true in it, for explaining the history of the temptation. That Christ could regard men as satanic tempters has been shown. The prin-

cipal thing here (besides the ethical postulate, that every victory over temptation is complete only when it becomes a historical fact) is the chronological hint, that the return of the deputation to the Baptist from the Jordan to Jerusalem must have coincided with the return of Christ from the wilderness to the Jordan; further, the theocratic requirement that John owed to all his hearers, and must have given them, the clearest information respecting the Messiah; lastly, the historical circumstance, that the conflict between Christ and the hierarchy at Jerusalem came on so early in such a decisive manner. That exposition which would treat the narrative as a parable¹ has been disposed of by the remark, that in the construction of a parable historical persons are not made use of, and least of all does the maker of the parable introduce himself in the parable. Now we have seen, that the temptation, with all its simply defined historical precision, has an universal world-historical significance, and hence it is easily explained how it necessarily assumed in the representation a parabolic hue, as soon as the Lord, for good reasons, caused the historical elements of the temptation to retire behind the symbolic features which expressed their general meaning. (On this symbolism, see Hase, *Leben Jesu*, pp. 102, 103.) That explanation which would turn the whole transaction into a dream (Meyer, *Stud. und Krit.* 1831, Part 2), or into a vision (Paulus, *das Leben Jesu*, i. 142), we must regard as peculiarly unfortunate. A dream is not within the province of moral responsibility; and world-historical battles and spiritual conflicts are not fought out in the placid repose of a dream (see Ullmann). The state of ecstasy, too, must be regarded as the opposite pole to the state of moral wrestling in God's champions, though it comes under the same category of true spiritual life. But in the life of Christ the idea of ecstasy is altogether excluded, since in Him the great antagonism between the inmost life in the spirit and common existence which rendered possible the ecstasy of the prophets, is lost in the harmony of perfected life. The most meagre view of all is indisputably that which regards the transaction as made up from a number of Old Testament fragments, as, for example, Elijah's forty days' fast, &c. (Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, p. 446). At all events, we do too much honour to such an exposition, which treats New Testament facts as a piece of mosaic made up of fragments from the Old Testament, as a composition of the merest outward similarities, to which also Jewish tradition must contribute, if we designate it a mythical exposition. Mythical exposition must throughout first point to the Christian idea—and then show that from an aversion to the incarnation and to fact, this idea has turned into the bypath of its spiritualistic embodiment in the myth. These collectanea of Old Testament analogies to New Testament facts have, however, served to draw attention to the rhythmical relations in the theocratic history.²

¹ Schleiermacher on Luke, p. 54, &c.

² [A valuable criticism of the various theories of the temptation will be found in Meyer *in loc.*; by whom and by Ellicott (p. 110) the literature of the subject is given.

2. When the first temptation is designated a temptation to 'the sin of Genius,' to convert the objects of sense into nourishment for the spirit (Weisse, *Die evangel. Geschichte*, ii. 22), we may notice the change in the modern spirit of the age, which for some time was for regarding all the pleasures of sense with fanatical untruthfulness as nourishment for the spirit, devotion and worship, but which now has passed into a decided dualism, which goes to the length of regarding as sin the ennobling of the pleasures of sense into nourishment for the spirit.

3. The chronological difficulties which would make the history of the temptation uncertain, can be regarded only as assumed, if it is observed how plainly John the Baptist (according to John i. 28, 29), at the time when the deputation from Jerusalem left him, represents the divine attestation to Jesus at His baptism as a fact that had previously transpired. The day after the departure of the deputation, Jesus comes to him, and John exclaims: 'Behold the Lamb of God,' &c. This exclamation is a proof that Jesus had been pointed out as the Messiah by that extraordinary event. But even when the deputation came to John, the manifestation of Christ must have taken place; otherwise he could not have said of the Messiah that 'He stood among them,' an expression which presupposes the manifestation of the Messiah for Israel. Now, since the forty days' sojourn of Jesus in the wilderness followed His baptism, and this sojourn was closed just after the return of the deputation, the baptism must have taken place about forty days before their arrival at the Jordan. Negative criticism, in dealing with this chronological difficulty, is just like a man's standing close under a bridge, and complaining that he finds no passage over, all the while running down the river, and never thinking of turning upwards. 'The Evangelist does not make the Baptist speak as if six weeks had intervened between the baptism of Jesus and the narrative he now gives.' Thus Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 428. This perfectly arbitrary assertion has, not without reason, met with ironical treatment from Ebrard.

S E C T I O N V I I I.

THE PLAN OF JESUS.

It was the blessed result of the temptation which Jesus passed through in the wilderness, that the whole course, as it was to be

The condemnations in the latter are too indiscriminate. Did he forget that what he calls 'the monstrous opinion that the tempter was human' was adopted by Bengel? ('Videtur tentator sub schemate scribe apparuisse.') However, it is to be borne in mind, that in the other instances where Satan used human agency we are made distinctly aware of this by the narrative, whereas in the case before us no such intimation is given, and certainly a different impression conveyed. It is therefore mere hypothesis that Satan here acted through hierarchical or other human persons; and some may be disposed to reject the hypothesis on the score of its needlessness. Besides that the supposition of intervening persons must be suspected of proceeding from and tending towards a disbelief of the power of Satan to act on the soul of man immediately, as spirit on spirit. From this suspicion the author clears himself above.—ED.]

developed in perfect fidelity to God, was shaped clearly before His eyes, and settled in the choice of His heart. When He wrestled with the tempter, who wished to take from Him the attested evidence of His divine mission, the whole evidence unrolled itself, and He grasped it as a clear plan of His career. The first man passed beyond his former condition of life by transgression ; the second by the preservation of His righteousness. When He rejected the satanic plan in all its parts, He gained the most definite and perspicuous counterpart of it, the plan of His future, of His earthly sojourn.

May we be allowed to describe this ideal conception of His career, which Christ gained by the temptation, as His own PLAN? The term is at all events easily misunderstood, and at the best is feeble in relation to the great thought which in this case it must bear ; and yet it is not easy to find a substitute for it. Christ gained in the wilderness a distinct survey of His real course through life. But the most powerful, freest self-determination was connected with this survey, which might, therefore, be regarded as His choice. He had chosen His life's course when He returned from the wilderness. But this choice was not merely dynamic, but a deliberate arrangement of various parts—an internal programme—the ideal delineation of His pilgrimage. If we seek for the most suitable word to designate this ideal draught of the career of Jesus, we shall be led back to the word PLAN.¹

Not only does reflection form plans, but enthusiasm. Plan, indeed, often stands in contrast to the simple, noble frankness of disposition as a product of calculating design. But the discipline of the Spirit which refines the enthusiasm that pours itself forth irregularly, and which leads to clearness of perception respecting its functions, also compels to the formation of a plan. Not only civil concerns, diplomatic negotiations, and political intrigues rest upon definite plans, but still more the glorious works of art. A perfect work of art is, in its essential characteristics, prepared before its actual execution. Now it would be decidedly at variance with Christ's life, if we were to admit that He had not reached this ideal formation of His life in His inner man, but proceeded to His work with a blind enthusiasm. The New Testament age begins from the first in a decided consciousness, which is in unison with the highest rapture of inspiration. This is the specific nature of Christianity, that, on the one hand, its enthusiasm is not pathological or pythical, and that, on the other, its clearness of spirit and consciousness is not reflection or enlightening of the finite by the finite.

¹ Two of the most distinguished theologians of our time hold opposite opinions in reference to the use of this word in the representation of the life of Jesus. Ullmann expresses himself against the word (*On the Sinlessness of Jesus*, p. 92). Neander is in favour of it (*Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 80 [Bohn's ed.]). But Neander does not dispute Ullmann's view as to its meaning. He only claims for the word *plan* a higher sense in this connection. ['The "plan" of our Saviour's ministry is a topic which most of the modern lives of our Lord discuss with a very unbecoming freedom.'—Ellicott, p. 99.—ED.]

Therefore provision was made that Christ might enter on His career with perfected consciousness and developed distinctness.

We have already seen that Christ's plan could not be that of a political Messiah. Christ would have contradicted His own nature and calling, if He had wished to erect the political transformation of the world on the rotten basis of the corruption, religious and moral, of the ancient world. Even John the Baptist was far above such modern, demagogical ideas, to say nothing of Christ. But if Christ had first of all proceeded in such a false direction, and had been punished in it by failure, and thus thrown into the purely spiritual direction, after such a check He could not possibly have accomplished the pure ideal work of the world's redemption. We may without any hesitation affirm that this would have been a fatal blow to the doctrine, precluding, that is, its application to moral relations. For a false swing of the pendulum, when it is over, is always followed by a counter vibration which is sure to produce a one-sidedness, even if it does not rebound again into the false. But a one-sidedness, such as might prove an ornament to the life of an Augustin, would form a remediless defect in the life of Jesus.¹ And such a one-sidedness there would have been, if Christ had wished to confine His mission and agency for all ages to the spiritual. The institution of the holy sacrament clearly proves that Christ intended to take possession of the whole phenomenal world. The sacraments represent this taking possession in symbolically significant beginnings. They form the germ of the world's transformation; and since they constitute what belongs to the essence of the Church, we may regard the Church as the seed-corn of Christ's commonwealth.

It was therefore Christ's leading thought in the predetermination of His career, that He wished to lay the foundation of a new world deep in the spiritual life of humanity, by spiritual operations. Since He had descended into the depths of the world's corruption which confronted Him in the temptation, even to the point where He could seize and destroy it in its foundations, He saw clearly that in all-subduing love, in the firmest confidence, in perfect humility, and with the greatest boldness of spirit, He must go down even to hell; that He could find the world's deliverance only in the most awful world's judgment, and even in the deepest death of His own life. Thus was He obliged to lay the foundation of His work deep in the foundations, or rather in the abysses, of the spiritual world. The more He thus measured the spiritual depths of His work, the fainter must have been the prospect of bringing it into manifestation in the days of His earthly pilgrimage; but the more clearly must He have seen before Him the whole world-historical descent into hell, which He, and with Him the Church, had to experience in the world, and the more must the future unfolding of His economy in the world have

¹ See Ullmann *On the Sinlessness of Jesus*. This theologian has successfully combated the view mentioned above.

appeared as the bright image of an unchangeable glory, as an infinitely splendid ascension to heaven. But especially it appeared to the Lord absolutely necessary to veil the consciousness of His divine dignity and Messiahship as a great mystery from the profane mind of His nation. The Jews could not hear of the Messiah without being intoxicated with political fanaticism on His account, or with hierarchical fanaticism, incurring guilt towards Him even to death. And yet it was absolutely needful that men should learn to know Him as the Messiah in order to find salvation in Him. Hence it was Christ's first business to veil or unveil the mystery of His inner life with the clearest foresight of redeeming love, according to the measure of the spiritual necessities of the world. Thus in the wilderness He carefully veiled Himself before the tempter, in the garb of a plain man, a pious Jew. He expressed the glory of His inner life in Scripture passages, in, if we may so say, catechetical words. And when the Jews wished to make Him a king, when the demon of political enthusiasm began to work, He withdrew from the excited multitude and retired apart to pray. When the demoniacs proclaimed the fact of His Messiahship, which they had perhaps become cognizant of by a morbid relation of the soul to His consciousness, He rebuked them. He trusted Himself to no one, for He well knew what was in man (John ii. 24). It is an evidence of the heavenly fervour which His heart maintained under all this caution, that He at once made known His dignity to the Samaritan woman; that almost immediately He told this poor sin-laden female that He was the Messiah (John iv. 26). To her He ventured to reveal His Messianic dignity, for in Samaria there was not the danger connected with this revelation which in Judea made such a revelation impossible. And herein the power of His self-determination is manifest, which enabled Him to control the ardour of His soul, that He guarded His inner man with so perfect a mastery in humility from the profanation of the Jews. How long did Christ wait before He raised the conviction of the disciples themselves to full certainty that He was the Messiah! But it is a fact of appalling solemnity, that He did not impart the secret of His Messianic glory to the head of the nation, the high priest, till it had been demanded of him as a judicial confession, and the non-recognition of His real dignity had so far prevailed, that this confession was the occasion of His death (Matt. xxvi. 64). Not till then was His secret fully secured from the boundless chiliastic worldliness which confronted Him, when He divulged it in the most solemn manner before the Sanhedrim of His nation, and not till then was completed the veiling of Christ's life from all the profane spirits and thoughts in the world. With the crown of thorns and the reed sceptre, He came into the midst of the world's history in a form in which He could be manifest only by His spirit to the best, the elect of men. And still the cloud of Christ's world-historical ignominy ever veils the holy of holies of His nature from the eyes of those who would turn spiritual glory into carnal. But

though Christ, at the beginning of His public life, was firmly resolved to use the name of Messiah only with the greatest caution, since the Jews would have cherished a radically false notion of Him, as soon as they received Him under this name; yet, in His divine truthfulness, He could not help designating His unique nature by a corresponding expression. For this purpose He found the phrase THE SON OF MAN, which is employed in the prophecies of Daniel (vii. 13). Jewish expectation had not laid hold of this expression, as of the other Old Testament designations of the Messiah,¹ and yet it was as characteristic as any other. It gave prominence to exactly that side in the nature of Christ which was to form the special redeeming counterpoise to the illusions of the Jews and of the world. The Jews expected in their Messiah the Son of God. This Son of God was, indeed, to be also a man, but not in the free universality of the human, but in the sense of pharisaic Judaism, and in the sense of a superhuman royal dignity—a demon-like Jew of extraordinary power. To this morbid expectation, Christ opposed His humanity and humaneness when He called Himself *the Son of man*. He wished above all things to be known as a true man—as a poor pilgrim (Matt. viii. 20)—as a man of the meanest appearance, who might easily be misjudged (Matt. xii. 32)—as a child of man who, like every other, was subject to the eternal decrees of God (Matt. xxvi. 24); yea, as one who was looked down upon contemptuously by mankind, despised and rejected; who was to be the most marked man on the scale of human misery (Mark viii. 31). Already as such a human being, belonging to the human race, in the reality of His life and sufferings the Lord contradicted the fantastic, orientally exaggerated image of a king, by which the Jew celebrated his Messiah as superhumanly prosperous. But also in the sense of humaneness, of free philanthropy, Christ wished to represent mankind. In the forbearance with which He treated His infatuated adversaries (Luke ix. 56); in the universality with which He devoted His saving love to all the lost (Luke xix. 10); in the power, lastly, with which He exercised His humaneness in the heroic service of philanthropy in His redeeming death (Matt. xx. 28),—He presented the bright image of divine humanity as the soul of the life, in opposition to the Jewish pride of ancestry which would have subjected the human race to Judaism, divesting it as far as might be of its proper humanity. But this expressive demonstration of His being man leads to the conviction, that Jesus in a peculiar sense felt as man. He was not a singular particular man, but THE MAN simply as the Prince of men. But He was not only THE MAN simply, but the Son of man, since He was descended from humanity through the Virgin. Humanity had been pregnant with Him in its wrestling after the righteousness of God, in its aspirations it had brought

¹ Neander rightly directs attention to the fact, that this want of familiarity with the meaning of the name ‘the Son of man,’ among the Jews, may be inferred from John xii. 34.

Him forth under the operation of the Spirit. In the power of this descent He represented the second, higher generation of humanity; He is the second man, the man of the Spirit who is from heaven—the wondrous flower which appears as a bright flame of heaven on the top of the old, dark, decaying genealogical tree of earthly humanity (John iii. 13).¹ Christ therefore expressed the perfected spirituality of His natural human life when He came forward with this name. With this He demands of the hierarchy in Israel, of His own nation, and of the whole world, perfect regeneration by His Spirit (John iii. 3). But although Christ adopted the title, *Son of man*, in order to express and carry out the contrariety between His life and the Messianic expectation of the Jews, and all the chiliastic worship in the world of noble birth and genius, yet He did not thereby wish to contradict in the least the true, prophetic Messianic expectation in Israel. He was perfectly aware that He was announced as the Son of man by the prophets, and also that this name denoted the Messiah. The words He uttered in the Sanhedrim—‘Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven’ (Matt. xxvi. 64)—very distinctly allude to the designation of the Messiah in the prophecies of Daniel. Jesus had therefore consciously selected from among the titles of the Messiah, exactly that which marked Him as the future Judge of the world. But He chose it on this account, because, among the various designations of the theocratic Prince, it was the title that seemed suited to preserve or divulge His incognito among His nation, in proportion as it might be needful. But at that juncture, when the hierarchy were on the point of condemning the Messiah, He found it necessary to bring forward very distinctly the Old Testament use of this name in reference to the Messiah, and by which He was accustomed to appear in their midst, in order that they might not be able to accuse Him of having led them into a mistake respecting His nature by using a non-theocratic name. He did this in a declaration respecting the Son of man, which made it clear that He was the same wonderful Son of man of whom Daniel had prophesied. In the same degree, therefore, as this name served for the concealment of His nature, it also served for unveiling it to all susceptible spirits. It has, in the course of the world’s history, taken under its protection the doctrine of the incarnation of God against all idealist or gnostic attempts to explain away the personality of Christ;—the doctrine of the divine destiny of humanity, against all monkish or materialistic contempt of human life;—and lastly, the doctrine of the universal call of humanity to salvation, against the perversions of the doctrine of election;—with strong and powerful efficiency.

¹ See my work, *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter, &c.*, p. 68. Weisse, *die evang. Geschichte*. Weisse is mistaken in regarding the view here given as a novel explanation, as any one may be convinced by the preceding quotation. The author of the first work had already obtained this view from another. Weisse’s assertion, that this name is placed in the Gospel history in opposition as good as expressed to the name of the Messiah, is certainly novel.

In truth, this title of Christ encloses a richness of meaning which is continually unfolding itself with increasing glory, and can fully manifest its hidden splendour only when the Son of man shall summon the world before Him in His judicial glory.¹ (John v. 27 ; Matt. xxv. 31.)

When therefore the Lord was certain that He must veil the consciousness of His Messianic glory before the world, and could only unfold it with the greatest caution,—that the gradual disclosure of this dignity is the judgment of the world, and that its completed revelation will coincide with the final judgment, it was at the same time decided in His soul that He must abide under the law in Israel until the time of His personal glorification. He was, therefore, consciously ‘made under the law’ (Gal. iv. 4). He was obedient to human ordinances, as ordinances of God, even unto death, the death of the cross (Phil. ii. 8), in order to communicate His divine-human life to the life of the world, to implant it in the world. In the apostle’s words just quoted the progressive stages of this obedience to the lowest depths are indicated. In the human jurisdiction to which the Lord was subjected, there appears a definite succession of stages in the historic exhibition of eternal ideal right in which He moved, as a peculiar life-element, one with His own life. The first form of historic right appears in the monotheistic original laws of the patriarchs (John vii. 22). To these laws He was already bound by circumcision. Its second form appears in the theocratic national law of Israel given by Moses. This law also He acknowledged in His life and conduct (John vii. 23), and intimated to the Jews that He was placed under it (Mark x. 19). Further, the historic right took a third form in the teachings of the prophets. These also were held sacred by the Lord, as He plainly showed by submitting to John’s baptism, which He did in order to fulfil all righteousness. These three historical forms of eternal right appeared to Him as the pure lineaments of ideal life—as the several outlines of revelation, which in His life attained their living realization ; and so far He distinguishes them, taken together as holy writ, or as the law and the prophets, very distinctly from the later historical stage of order and right,—that is, from the maxims of the scribes, the decisions of the hierarchical government, and the administration of political power. The three former stages of right embrace the theocratical forms of historical right ; the three latter, its hierarchical and political forms. But although in these latter forms of right He perceived great and serious misrepresentations of eternal right, and even flagrant contradictions, yet He valued them as regulations of life, to which He at all times rendered obedience in their limited sphere. We can therefore regard these forms as the second half of the stages of historical right. The ordinances of the elders form, then, the fourth historical unfolding

¹ [For the title itself as found in Daniel, see Hengstenberg’s Christology, iii. 83 (Clark’s Tr.) ; and for the reasons of our Lord’s adoption of it, see Dorner on the Person of Christ, i. 54 (Tr.)—ED.]

of right : He also declares their national authority in express terms (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3, 23). The ecclesiastical government in Israel forms the fifth region of historical valid right. To this jurisdiction also He submitted with free recognition as an Israelite (Matt. v. 22),¹ even to death (Matt. xxvi. 64). Lastly, the sixth form of historical right is seen in the political authorities that confronted the Lord as an abstract, purely civil power. This power also He acknowledged in its sphere, as a power ordained by God (Matt. xxii. 21) over the property and lives of those under it. He became obedient to this political right, even to the death of the cross, on the accursed tree which the Romans had planted in the land. Thus, from the stage of ideal right, which He specified as ‘from the beginning’ (Matt. xix. 8), from the first stage of which the right proceeds through all the stages, and which forms with them a cycle of seven stages of right, He descended to the lowest stage, and endured the extremest or most horrible destiny of the lowest stage —the cross, with entire resignation to the will of the Father. This obedience exhibits the historical consummation of the Incarnation, we might say, the historically satisfied consummation. But such an obedience Christ could not have rendered, if it had not been from the first His decided resolution. But the sharpness and decisiveness of His historical fidelity appear in all these spheres of right in the most luminous indications. He withdrew Himself from the people who would have made Him a king ; for He felt Himself to be a subject—His kingdom was not of this world : this was His political obedience. On the demand of the Sanhedrim, He made the declaration on oath that He was the Messiah : thus He acted as a member of the Jewish commonwealth. He gave a reply to the scribes by answering them out of the Old Testament, and allowed their gnat-straining to pass as long as it did not contradict higher laws. He held the prophetic right sacred, with a strictness which, as we have seen, went beyond that of the Baptist. But he adhered to the Mosaic right with a decisiveness which even curbed the first enthusiastic liberalism of the disciples. He clearly saw that He must confine Himself and His ministry, during His earthly pilgrimage, to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. xv. 24) ; and it is a very significant fact, that He granted aid to the Canaanitish woman only on the urgent intercession of His disciples. He could not begin His work among the heathen at the risk of destroying His work in Israel—that is, first of all, among His own disciples, —and therefore He let their intercession precede His aid. Just looking at this completeness of the national fidelity, we might assert that He was the most punctilious Jew, the King of the Jews. But He was so, because He was the Christ. His perfected love entered into all the conditions of its revelation and victory, in the whole

¹ The words ‘Whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council,’ are probably not merely figurative. They rather express the sharpest historical right. Whosoever marks his brother as a heretic, encroaches on the province of the Sanhedrim, who have to decide legally on points of doctrine ; he must therefore submit himself, with his brother, to the Sanhedrim.

historic form of a servant, in which alone it could complete its work with heavenly freedom. The Lord in His ministry paid particular attention to the patriarchal right; in His plan for the extension of His kingdom He placed the Samaritans as theocratic Monotheists before the Gentiles (Acts i. 8), and He gave as a reason for visiting Zaccheus the publican, that he also was a son of Abraham (Luke xix. 9). Abstract cosmopolites and legal theorists have no notion of free love in this scrupulous attention to the conditions of historical fidelity.

But this attention to conditions in the life of Christ because it was a perfectly conscious act of pure love, and because it was in unison with His life, could appear only as a result of the purest self-limitation and of the freedom of His Spirit. He never could render historic obedience, so as to place Himself in contradiction to eternal right, to the divine righteousness which was His very life. Rather could He only so exhibit His fulfilling of the law, that, by virtue of the ideal feeling of right, He corresponded to the ideal life-point in the historic right itself, to the will of God in Him; and therefore He decidedly rejected every claim in which the historic right contradicted the ideal, or, which is the same thing, in which the lower right contradicted the higher. Wherefore from the first He could not allow the semblance to arise, of being in His inner man an unwilling servant of the existing public constitution. He wished His own historical obedience to be regarded as an act of freedom. Thus He preserved divine freedom even in submission to Pilate (John xviii. 36), and equally before the disciples (Matt. xxvi. 53) and before the armed band (ver. 55), and especially by His dignified silence before the Sanhedrim. With such an express preservation of His Messianic dignity He observed the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8); He paid the temple-tax (Matt. xvii. 27); and appealed to the testimony of John the Baptist (John v. 33, 34), to the writings of Moses (John v. 46), and lastly, to His correspondence with the spiritual vision of Abraham (John viii. 56, 58). If especially we estimate, according to their full meaning, the words which He spoke before the Sanhedrim respecting His judicial glory, they will strike us as an appeal from their judgment to the tribunal of God, and as a summons to appear before His own tribunal at His second coming to judge the world.

These protestations of Jesus ought to secure the world from the false notion that He was fettered by its ordinances according to its own want of freedom. But His own life was ensured by the circumstance that He recognized, in the discharge of His historical obedience, the completion of His destiny and the fulfilment of Scripture (Matt. xxvi. 54). It was clear to Him that only in this way of self-renunciation could He attain to the most complete manifestation of Himself as bringing salvation to the world. The entire unfolding of the fidelity of His heart, of the holiness of His spirit, was possible only by means of this most complete obscuration of His glory. But in this sense He also fulfilled the law and

His own destiny. His life gave a new shape and meaning to all the forms into which its contents were poured. By His political obedience He shed a lustre on the sphere of civil order, as a sphere of the all-powerful governing righteousness of God; He thereby made the civil obedience even of the oppressed free. He caused the suffering of the oppressed to appear as a suffering of national retribution (John xix. 11), and the suffering of the innocent as a seed-time of blessing and honour. In the sphere of political relations, He always kept the domain of God separate from that of Cæsar; and since by this means he set the spirit and conscience at liberty, He sowed likewise the seeds of civil freedom. But His ecclesiastical obedience to the Sanhedrim must have put the final seal to His Messianic manifestation. The Sanhedrim rendered His cause this service, that it made Him attest His Messiahship on oath before the highest ecclesiastical judicature in the world, and it was chiefly owing to their opposition that the whole riches of His life were unfolded. The disputations of Jesus with the scribes laid the foundation for unveiling the New Testament in the Old, and for distinguishing the New Testament form of revelation from that of the Old. His faithful adherence to the prophets contributed to bring forward several features and stages of His life in all their spiritual depth and world-historical importance. Then, lastly, as to His relation to the law, He could not fail to perceive that the pure theocratic lineaments of the law were the outline of a life infinitely rich, namely, of His own, and that for that reason they must necessarily be transferred into the lines of eternal beauty, of the divine-human life, as soon as He filled them up with the contents of His own life. Under His breath all the buds on the thorn-bush of the Old Testament law must unfold, and the roses of the New Covenant expand in profusion. The law pronounces a curse on the transgressor, at the same time it announces a blessing, the blessedness of the righteous. In its negations it describes all the forms of the sinner; but in its positivity and unity it is the sketch of the holy life of the God-man. But in this deep reference to Christ, the so-called moral law—the civil social law of Moses—did not stand alone; the ceremonial, or ecclesiastical social law, was also included. It was a shadowy representation of the life and sufferings of Christ, so that every form of it acquired in the conduct of Christ a New Testament significance. The pilgrimages of Christ to attend the feasts of the law became the journeyings of free, beneficent love; and from the feast of the Passover bloomed forth the Holy Supper. But the types of this law were sufficient of themselves to reveal to the Lord the grievous termination of His life. If He had not been familiarized with the dark side of His future by the serious portents of His sacrificial death in the history of His childhood, by so many a bitter experience of His youth, and by the predictions of the prophets, yet the fearful symbolic language of the sacrificial system would have led to the same result. For He, in whose spirit the Theocracy was consummated, must certainly have known how to

interpret the spirit of its signs. The same holds good of the theocratic dignities which were comprehended in the name of the Messiah. He would not have understood the official title of His own being, had He not been conscious that in the actual anointing of His spirit's fulness all the theocratic offices and dignities were united according to their deepest meaning in His personality, and were to be realized in His vocation. He must have been perfectly aware that His being, as the complete revelation of the Father, was itself prophecy completed; that in His pure self-surrender to the Father, the full meaning of the sacerdotal office appeared, and it became His calling to give Himself for the life of the world; that, finally, His Spirit was the true, eternal King of humanity, and therefore by His Spirit He was to establish His kingdom in the world. Thus, in the consciousness of His Messianic dignity the chief outlines of His ministry were given. But these outlines came out more distinctly to His view by means of the lineaments of the law and the intimations of the prophets.

It was therefore evident to the Lord at the commencement of His public life, that he came to fulfil the law and the prophets; that is, to unfold by His life no less than by His teaching the whole ideal contents of those lineaments of the law and intimations of the prophets, according to the spirit from which they emanated. But it belonged to this fulfilment that He interpreted the three theocratic forms of the historic right by the ideal law, and that by the same law He adjusted the three hierarchico-political forms of the historic right—that, generally, He corrected the lower laws by the higher, and thus restored the true ideal order of ordinances in the exhibition of the supremacy and subordination of the various rights. The development of historic right, as it is conducted by the hierarchy or by political rulers (the civil power), appears oftentimes as a tedious gradual inversion of the eternal ordinances of right by which the undermost becomes changed to the uppermost. The rights of Cæsar often supplant the rights of God by being made rights of conscience; ecclesiastical regulations often paralyze the exposition of Scripture by quenching the Spirit; the expositor often obscures the prophets and law of God by false glosses. In this manner a slow and secret revolution is going on in a thousand ways under the surface of the most quiet historic conformity to the law, and an unbounded desolation is effected in the domain of the spiritual life. These insidious revolutions in the history of the world are sure to be done away with by reforming spirits. Thus Christ as a reformer confronted the revolutionary desolation which the hierarchy of His nation especially had caused. Generally, He vindicated in the widest extent the ideal order of the historical relations of right. He held the power of the magistrate sacred as ordained by God, and was subject to it in its sphere; but he would not be fettered by it in the sphere of His prophetic calling. When Herod, His prince, wished to scare Him away by artifice from the scene of His ministry in Galilee, He answered his messengers,

' Go ye and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected' (Luke xiii. 32). And when the same prince ' hoped to have seen some miracle from Him, and questioned Him in many words, He answered him nothing' (Luke xxiii. 8, 9). To Pilate He spoke of his sin, and stood in his presence as the King in the kingdom of truth. However, He appears to have acknowledged his judicial right, chiefly because He had been delivered to him by the Sanhedrim (John xviii. 34, xix. 11). For, in matters of Jewish ecclesiastical law, He regarded the Sanhedrim as the supreme court. But when the Sanhedrim or Pharisaism wished to obstruct Him in His higher dignity, in His prophetic calling, He gave way not a single step. Collisions on this ground He never shunned in the least: this is shown by the frequent cures He performed on the Sabbath. He pronounced a woe on the scribes and Pharisees because they broke the law of the Sabbath by their traditions (Matt. xxiii.; Mark vii. 13). But He also showed how the law of Moses was subordinate to the fundamental monotheistic law of the patriarchs; and, lastly, how it was subordinate to the ideal original law of humanity (Matt. xii. 8; Mark ii. 27, iii. 4), and how even the patriarchal regulations—for instance, the custom of divorce sanctioned by Moses—ought to be determined according to this primeval law, which was at one with the moral nature of man and the immediate expression of the divine will (Matt. xix. 9). Indeed, there can be no real contradiction between the theocratic rights as they proceed from the patriarchs, from Moses and the prophets, and the eternal primeval laws, but the former are to be explained by the latter. But Christ could not possibly have restored the ideal order of right with such exact and discriminating certainty, had He not been animated by the spirit of the law. In this spirit He could unfold, arrange, and fill up the law, and therefore change it into spirit and life. The entire ideal contents of all divine and human rights were taken up into His very life. Therefore not a tittle of the law perished; every single declaration of it was found again in His life, in the form of the Spirit.

It was evident to our Lord at the commencement of His ministry, that in this manner He must come forward as a reformer of the historical relations of right in His age. The restoration of the ideal stages of right was therefore an essential element of His plan. But this consciousness must necessarily have produced in Him the anticipation of His sufferings, and indeed of His civil doom. Had He not been conversant with the predictions of the prophets concerning the sufferings of the Messiah, and had He come in no other way to this anticipation, yet He would have reached it with perfect certainty from the conflict between the divinely firm decisiveness of His heavenly ideality or holiness, and the petrified rigidity of the hierarchical statutes and social corruptions. In the necessary consequence of the system which stood opposed to Him, the entire depth of suffering which awaited Him might be unfolded to His

view. No sooner was His rejection on the part of the hierarchy certain, than the certainty must also have been present to His soul, that they would deliver Him up to the Gentiles. This delivering up, of which He had already found an announcement in the prophets (Matt. xxi. 42), was the central point of His anticipations, and a chief ingredient in the grief which always pressed heavy on His soul. But then the result of this act of the hierarchy could not be concealed from the spirit of Christ. He foresaw that the Gentiles would reject Him as well as the Jews; and as He was aware that the severest punishment of the Romans, the strongest expression of the world's curse, consisted in crucifixion, His spirit would always descry as the last object in the path of His sufferings, the death of the cross. As often as in spirit He looked down the precipice of the rejection which awaited Him, His eye found no resting-place short of the abyss of misery and shame on the cross. In such an anticipation, the particular features of His suffering would more easily present themselves the more closely they were connected with the nature of this suffering; as, for example, the spitting with excommunication, the scourging with the crucifixion. But it was simply impossible that Christ could look down into the whole abyss of His sufferings and crucifixion, without perceiving with equal clearness the opposite heights of His glorification. This glorification was assured to Him by faith in the Father, in His righteousness and faithfulness, and by the voice of the prophets as well as by the consciousness of being without a parallel, and by the inner power of life and victory which marked His personal being. But as His death was unparalleled, so likewise must His life appear to Him: deep as was the descent, so high would be the ascent; steep as was the precipice of descent, so would the exaltation be sudden and lofty; appalling to an unheard-of degree as was His judgment, so would His vindication be wonderful and glorious. Thus the mystery of His resurrection would be disclosed to the Lord by this distinct foresight of His humiliation. Lastly, in order to mark His foresight most exactly as christological, we must observe that in His death He must have seen the centre and beginning of the final judgment of the world, and therefore in His victory have looked for the principle, the real beginning of the future resurrection, and, of course, the resurrection of individuals.

But not only was His personal glorification present to His soul, but also its world-historical unfolding in the glorification of the Church. His Church must suffer with Him and be glorified with Him. And as it was impossible to separate His own destiny from that of His Church, it was equally impossible to disjoin the efficacy of His death from the efficacy of His resurrection. Hence His death appeared to Him as the beginning of the glorification of His name and of His work in the world (John iii. 14, xii. 23). With His death the entire ancient period of the world was brought to its completion, especially its law and its prophecy. He became free from the law on the cross, since a distorted representation of the

law crucified Him. Henceforth the entire essence of the law was preserved and enshrined in the life of His spirit; but its whole form, as to its religious importance, was exploded and dissipated. His death, therefore, was purely identical with the abolition of the rights of the Jewish hierarchy, as well as with the annihilation of the ancient value of the temple (John ii. 19). His spirit was now released from all Jewish legal restraints; His new life belonged to Him alone in His free glory, but in His love it belonged to mankind. His Church also was called to enter by His death into this communion of His freedom. As Christ's Church, it is essentially free in Him; and when it submits to legal restraints, it does this in the spirit of freedom, in the unfolding of its life for the world, and in its ardent desire to imbue the life of the world with its own life. As a royal and priestly Church, as the bride equal in dignity of birth to Himself (Matt. xxii. 2), the Church, which was to be the reward of His sufferings, stood before His soul.

Christ's foresight could not indeed take the shape of reflection or laborious deduction. But still the threads of the essential relations between the events of His future were the already marked track which must have been lighted up before His eye, when the prophetic spirit in Him, as by flashes of lightning, threw one great illumination after another over the field of His future. And it is necessary that we should most clearly perceive these essential relations, if we would properly estimate the full distinctness, the bold relief, of so many separate features in the future as foreseen by Christ. If, for example, we have recognized the cross as the lowest depth in the region of the ancient curse of the world, we conceive that the Lord with His deepest humiliation was already assured of His death on the cross. But His foresight was matched by His resolution to persist firmly and intrepidly in the path of His Father's guidance—to reject all the enticements to bypaths as satanic voices—in all the sufferings which He was destined to meet on this path, to look only to the Father's regulative will, and in the judgment which this will ordained for the guilt of the world, to welcome the atonement, and with perfect acquiescence in this judgment, to complete the atonement for the world.

But if Christ was so familiar in His spirit with the fearful path of death on which He was to accomplish His work,—and with the glory which awaited Him on that path,—the question arises, How, with a clear foresight of the future, could He lead a genuine human life devoted to the present? In our times there has been a disposition to find manifold contradictions between the separate elements of such a foresight, and opposite moods or states of feeling in the life of Jesus. It has been asked, for instance, if Jesus was certain of His glorification, how could He be so deeply agonized in Gethsemane? or, if this suffering of death still stood before Him, how could He triumph beforehand in His high-priestly prayer? How could He weep at the grave of Lazarus, when He was on the point of raising Him from the dead? All these questions seem to pro-

ceed from a mode of viewing things, which is more conversant with the nature of petrifications than with the nature of the human soul. The human heart, placed between the infinite and the finite, and forming the centre of these two departments of life, has a wonderful facility in evil as well as in good of varying its moods in quick succession—now in ‘heavenly ecstasy,’ and anon ‘exceeding sorrowful unto death ;’ and more or less to lose sight of the greatest good fortune near at hand in the misfortune of the present moment, or of the heaviest impending calamity in the enjoyment of the passing hour. Is not all the cheerfulness of human life confronted by the certainty of death ? Do not all the tears of the pious flow under the anticipation that a harvest of joy is awaiting them. In relation to this subject, modern criticism has framed a category of impossibilities, which we must regard as a perpetual petrifying of the human heart, begun under the operation of a philosophic abstraction which looks with contempt on concrete life. But the more competent we are to estimate the giant-harp of human emotion and the quick alternation of its tones, the more able shall we be to understand that region in which the human soul appears in heroic proportions, and where the fiercest battle of life is fought out in the most varied situations, under the liveliest play of the strongest emotions. In this freshness and power of human nature, Jesus was also the Prince of His race. It belonged to the healthy state of His human life, that with a genuine human bearing and disposition He could reveal heaven, and conquer hell, and experience in His own mental moods the whole contrast of descent to hell and ascension to heaven. This healthy state of His life may be compared to a finished musical performance. The life of Jesus is, first of all, to be regarded in its rhythm as a complete life. He moves in the measure of the most correct succession of His internal states of feeling ; He does not with His states of feeling lag behind the time or measure of reality, and as little does He impatiently hasten before it. Hence His future lies before Him in correct perspective. He cannot possibly derange the order of His life’s course. He could not, on the one hand, as a dreamer in a literal sense, anticipate the particular circumstances of His future experience ; nor, on the other hand, could He ever live a day without observing the strict relation of every step to His final aim. From this fundamental law of His life’s course resulted the rhythmical, that is, measured recurrence in the presentiment of His death as well as in the presentiment of His glory. This rhythm of His life was connected with its dynamic perfection. Christ spent every instant as a moment of eternity. He gave to every experience its correct intonation. He often allowed extraordinary phenomena, such as the storm on the lake, to pass over His soul like mere shadows, while an incident apparently insignificant, such as that of the Greeks wishing to see Him (John xii. 20), agitated Him violently. But He so correctly estimated impressions, that His counteraction of them was perfectly proportional. This delicately adjusted dynamic gives His life the expres-

siveness of a vitality and power combining heavenly tenderness and strength : the gentlest tones, the slightest breathings, alternate with such as are the sharpest, strongest, and most startling. Hence Christ estimated every event according to its just importance : the signs of His future must have met Him in all His experiences with constantly increasing distinctness ; for every single moment has the significance of a symbol for all the moments with which it forms a whole. Thus to Christ's eye the dark night of His betrayal began to cast its shadows from the first embezzlement which Judas committed on the common stock. When Peter protested against His crucifixion, He probably saw at that hour a clear prognostic that this disciple would afterwards deny Him. And since every important fact had in the spiritual hearing of Christ the tone of its precise significance, so the hosannahs of the feast of palms could as little efface from His expectations the approaching crucifixion, as the cry, 'Crucify Him !' could efface the resurrection. If it be asked, How was it possible for the life of Jesus to represent itself in these refined, ideal, dynamic relations, we must seek the solution in its melodious beauty. The life of our Lord had in all its parts a complete lyric elevation and musical euphony, since He apprehended every fact of experience in God, and set forth every fact of activity with divine freedom. His consciousness stript from every experience the fact of evil, as that which was opposed to God and must come to nought, and sent it back to hell, in order to receive the fact itself as a consecrated ordinance from the hand of God. Even His last agony and judgment appeared to Him as a cup in the Father's hand, as a holy cup of the purest gold, which, in spite of the intense bitterness of its contents, He was ready to empty for the health of the world. His life, therefore, was sustained in all its utterances by the beautiful euphony of a bass, in which the pure human heart constantly rested in God's fulness ; and the eternal glory of God revealed itself in the sensibility and distinctness of man perfected in beauty. This melody of the life of Jesus allowed no disturbance to spring up in His inner man respecting His future ; but, in consequence of the opulence of His soul's life, it must needs unfold itself in the most exquisite harmony. It was in the nature of the case, that the soul of Christ could not be governed or wholly filled by any natural mood (*Naturstimmung*) of human life or by any single exclusive affection. With one pure feeling which moved Him, every other was in unison, as is conformable to life in the Spirit. And when one feeling expressed itself as the predominant tone in the highest degree, the other opposite one came forth in the purest harmonic relation. The two deepest feelings of His soul, relative to His future, were the presentiment of His condemnation and the presentiment of His glory. These two secrets, the one most mournful, the other most blessed, were moving jointly and incessantly in His heart. In the captivating form of a blessed sadness, or of a veiled heavenly cheerfulness, which we may regard as the usual mental frame of Jesus, we see the gently moving counterpoise of

those fundamental feelings. The weights often oscillated according to the impressions which Christ received; sometimes one scale sank, sometimes the other. But never did the one feeling completely vanish before the other. In Gethsemane Christ appears dissolved in anguish and sorrow, especially in shuddering horror at the wickedness of the world; and with what touching pathos He here craves for human sympathy! and with what sublimity He raises Himself up! The prayer of His deepest agony on the cross, in which He divulges the crushing sense of being forsaken by God, is at the same time the expression of the highest confidence. And as in this manner the related tones of opposite moods are ever sounding together, we understand how it was that oftentimes the occasions of the Lord's greatest joy were exchanged at once for the deepest sadness, as, for example, the jubilation on His entrance into Jerusalem; while inversely His bitterest experiences could indirectly call forth the most glorious outbursts of joy, as was shown in the wonderful elevation of His soul after the traitor had left the company of the disciples. Thus Jesus overcame what was dangerous in every single affection by the free, harmonious, collective feeling of His life. But the perfection of this harmony was shown by His walking in the Spirit, and therefore the riches of His life always harmonized as a united whole in His spiritual life. By this power of His inner life, He resolved His prospects into His presentiments, His presentiments into His fundamental dispositions, and these again into the spirit of His life. The same may also be affirmed of His plan. Notwithstanding the clearness of its leading outlines, and the continual unfolding of its several portions, this plan still necessarily maintained the free, flexible form of the spiritual life in which Christ Himself moved. The words of Christ distinctly indicate that its separate lines always met in the primary thought, that He was going to the Father. From this primary thought the separate parts of His plan would always enter into new combinations, just according to the train of circumstances through which Christ passed. What He saw the Father do, that He also did. He therefore always met the objective universe, in which He beheld the Father's work, with a self-determination in which His own work combined with that of the Father in an act which should issue in the transformation of the world.

Thus, then, the life-plan of Jesus, as it was completed during the temptation in the wilderness, consisted in a self-determination, developed according to its fundamental principles, always unfolding according to its individual traits, and renewing itself in the Spirit,—a self-determination according to which He wished to combine His Messianic life with the life of the world. But as He combined His whole being and its world-historical name in general with the world by a definite unfolding of His life, so this especially holds good of the separate blessings of His life. He combined, that is to say, the power of His life, salvation, with the faith of the world in the form of His miracles. But the light of His life—the truth—He pre-

sented to the world under the guise of parables. Lastly, He made the blessedness of His life become the inheritance of the world by founding the kingdom of God. These fundamental forms of the revelation of His life we have now to contemplate.

NOTES.

1. On the unveiling of the Old Testament economy as accomplished by Christ, see Harnack, *Jesus der Christ*, p. 5. ‘ We must conceive of this “old to be fulfilled,” to which Christ refers, as an undivided whole, since He damaged it in no portion, He neither took away nor weakened any essential part. Hence an unprejudiced exegetical survey sees no reason for dividing the ideas of ὁ νόμος and οἱ προφῆται in a connection where their fulfilment is spoken of, but applies it to their full contents. Nor can we understand by what right each single chief division is to be taken for anything else than the whole law, and for the whole prophetic agency, when that designation (as is almost universally allowed) embraces the entire Old Testament, according to the constant phraseology of the New Testament.’—P. 11.

2. In the teaching of Christ a doctrine of right (a law) is contained, which comprises much sharper and more developed distinctions than is commonly admitted. The sphere that rules all positive spheres of right is that of ideal right, which is similar to the eternal in man, or to the essence of the Son of man. This right has been transplanted into the world in the form of the Gospel. The three spheres in which positive right has its sources, or in which ideal right becomes positive, are the circles of the Patriarchal, the Mosaic and the Prophetic Right. The patriarchal right has become fixed by tradition under the form of the Noachic ordinances, to which some other precepts belong. It is the right which forms the world-historical basis of monotheistic culture. Circumcision is the symbol of this sphere ; it marks the religious civilization of the individual. The essential in which the symbol is fulfilled is regeneration, especially the general culture. This stage of right is perpetuated in the general morality of the cultivated world. The Mosaic right is the basis of monotheistic educated society, of which the characteristic is, that every individual is estimated as a person. So especially is the Sabbath made for man—for his personality. In particular, it protects dependent persons in their eternal rights. The essential of the Mosaic right reappears in Christian state-life. Lastly, prophetic right is the development of positive right according to its spiritual nature, in its spiritual infinity ; the unfolding of the ideal law in the positive. This sphere has to exhibit the law in life. It is full of blessing and danger. The false prophet must be distinguished from the true. But he is judged according to his relation to the essential principles of the theocratic society, according to the positive divine law. This province of right is perpetuated in the free Church, and in science, art, and literature generally. The three following circles of right, which are exhibited in the maxims

of the scribes, in the Sanhedrim, and in political power, are the circles of the interpretation, the application, and the administration of right. The concrete, Christianly grounded, and educated state embraces these circles, as well as the theocratic, in living unity. They appear singly in the region of the Academic Faculties, which express themselves by systems and opinions ; in the region of Jurisprudence, according to right as it has been laid down ; and in the region of Government, which carries into effect what has been determined by law. The theocratic idea of the state has its highest point in the right of the sovereign to show mercy ; on the other hand, its lowest point is seen in the police : this restores the theocratic power in reference to the abandoned class.

3. The difficulties which Strauss has mustered against the idea of the Messianic plan (*Leben Jesu*, § 65–69) are summarily disposed of by the representation before us of the plan of Jesus. Thus, for example, the passage in Matt. xix. 28 is said to prove that Jesus designedly nourished expectations of a worldly Messiah in His disciples, because the promise, that in the Palingenesia they should be judges of the twelve tribes of Israel, could not merely denote in a figurative sense their participation of glory in that state. If the author, by the christological idea of the transformation of the world, had got beyond the dualism between the abstract present and the abstract future world, he would likewise have got beyond this difficulty. But this idea appears to him, in its concrete fulness, only as a ‘monstrous representation,’ p. 521. When it is further said (p. 529), that the views of Jesus respecting ‘the abrogation of the Mosaic law’ are ‘so different from those of Paul, that what the former regarded as not ceasing till His glorious advent or second coming to renew the earth, the latter believed he might abrogate in consequence of the first advent of the Messiah on the old earth,’ we must here especially distinguish between abrogating or taking away (*Abschaffung*) and raising—a lifting to a higher position (*Aufhebung*) ; secondly, between a religious and a national raising (*Aufhebung*) ; thirdly, between the centre and the periphery of the coming æon (*αιών μέλλων*), if we are to take a correct view of the subject. Christ Himself resolved to know nothing of an abrogation (*Abschaffung*), but only of a raising or elevation (*Aufhebung*) of it—a realization of the typical law in the life of the Spirit. Paul also, in this sense, found the Old Testament again in the New, and he, as little as Christ, abrogated the outward law, whose religious validity he impugned, in its national perpetuity. Lastly, as regards the new æon, Christ represented *Himself* as its principle and centre, and could not therefore attribute a religious validity to the law within the New Testament circle of His agency, that is, for the unfolding of this æon. The complete raising (*Aufhebung*) of the ancient legal conditions cannot take place till the future æon has gained its full periphery, which will be at the second coming of Christ. Consequently the passage in Matt. v. 18 may decidedly be understood to mean that the law would continue to exist in all its types, even to

an iota (though in many modifications of form), till it should attain in the new world a complete living reality; or the law would eternally remain, and indeed, as far as it has not yet become life, will it remain as law, so that it cannot vanish entirely in the legal form till the perfecting of the life. It is clear, therefore, that no religious validity of the law before the second advent of Christ, and no special abrogation of it after that event, was appointed. Rather must every 'jot and tittle' of the law be eternally realized, according to its original ideality. The relation of Jesus to the heathen must be explained by distinguishing between the economy of His earthly ministry and the economy of His Spirit. The difference in His treatment of the Gentile centurion (Matt. viii. 5) and of the Canaanitish woman (Matt. xv. 24) is sufficiently established. That centurion was (according to Luke vii. 3) a friend of the synagogue, and probably a proselyte of the gate. In his case, therefore, the spiritual conditions were present for the communication of miraculous aid. But in the Canaanitish woman these conditions were very questionable. At all events, it was requisite that the organ of theocratic faith should be fully unfolded in her, before Christ vouchsafed her a miraculous word. Besides, we must not overlook that intercession was made by the Jews when they saw the economical reluctance of Jesus. The history of the ministry of Jesus in Samaria will come later under consideration.

4. Strauss cites (vol. ii. p. 291) the well-known passages in which prophecies of the sufferings of the Messiah are found, and then goes on to affirm, that in these passages nothing whatever is said of Christ's sufferings, and closes with the assertion, 'If Jesus in a supernatural manner, by virtue of His higher nature, had found in these passages a pre-intimation of particular traits of His sufferings,—since such a reference is not the true sense of those passages,—the spirit in Jesus would not have been the spirit of truth, but a lying spirit.' Exactly in the same way he deals with the predictions of the resurrection, and in p. 323 repeats his unfortunate assertion, 'If a supernatural principle in Jesus, a prophetic spirit, had caused Him to find in these passages a pre-intimation of His resurrection,—since in none of them could such a reference really exist,—the spirit in Him could not be the spirit of truth, but must have been a lying spirit.' These assertions need no refutation; we only adduce them as historical notices. Just so the tendency of the critic to decide the question according to the popular representations which existed probably in the time of Christ, in reference to the sufferings of the Messiah, whether the Messiah announced His own death beforehand or not. 'If in the lifetime of Jesus it was a Jewish representation that the Messiah must die a violent death, there is every probability that Jesus would receive this representation into His own convictions, and communicate it to His disciples, &c.; on the other hand, if that representation had not been current among His countrymen before His death, it would still be possible,' &c. Lastly, we here class the question, Whence did Jesus, if He foresaw

His own death, know for certain whether Herod would not anticipate the priests' party, or who could assure Him that the hierarchy would not succeed in one of their tumultuary attempts at murder, and that, without being delivered to the Romans, He would lose His life in some other way than by the Roman punishment of crucifixion? We need not rise to the height on which Jesus stands in order to learn how to estimate the true nature of such questions. Who, for example, gave Napoleon the assurance that he would not die of the plague, when he went to Egypt with a presentiment of his future greatness? What assurance had Julius Cæsar in the storm at sea, that he could utter such bold words of confidence, that he would not perish in the waves? There were at that time no means of ensuring against the murderous disposition of a Herod and the stoning by Jewish fanatics; and thus it always remains a mystery in what way great men have been assured.

5. As to the question on the relation between the obscurer predictions of the death of Jesus in John and the more explicit ones in the synoptic Gospels, as Hasert has treated it in his work, *Ueber der Vorhersagungen Jesu von seinem Tode und seiner Auferstehung* (*On the Predictions by Jesus of His Death and Resurrection*), the previous question is of importance, to what times those single predictions belong. As these chronological data must first be distinctly explained in the sequel, we must return to this question respecting the said predictions. The gradual development of the foreseeing as well as of the predicting is indicated by the relation between Mark viii. 31 and x. 33, 34, or Luke ix. 22 and xviii. 32.¹

SECTION IX.

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS.

We have seen that Christ had decided on a mission in the world which was designed to form a great means of communication (*Vermittlung*) between the mystery of His glorious spiritual life, and the darkened, sickly, disharmonized world, which was not in a state to bear an unconditional unfolding of His glory. As one special form of this intervention for the purpose of incorporating the power of Christ with the world, we have, last of all, pointed out *Miracles*. By this reference of miracle to the means of communication, so as to place it under the same point of view as the evangelical parables and the founding of the New Testament kingdom of God, it is distinctly indicated that we apprehend miracles, first of all, on a

¹ [The literature of this, as indeed of all the topics connected with the life of Christ, is given by Hase in his *Leben Jesu*. Renan throughout represents Jesus as rather passively moulded by His age than determining His own character and life; and regarding His idea of His work, he says, p. 121: 'Beaucoup de vague restait sans doute dans sa pensée, et un noble sentiment, bien plus qu'un dessein arrêté, le poussait à l'œuvre sublime qui s'est réalisée par lui, bien que d'une manière fort différente de celle qu'il imaginait.' Some valuable remarks on the apologetic significance of the plan of Jesus are made by Young in *The Christ of History*, pp. 44 ff., and by Bushnell, *Nature and the Supernatural*, p. 207.—ED.]

side which forms a decided opposite to that in which it gives so much trouble to the critics who represent 'the culture of our age.' The miracles of Jesus appear, indeed, as very great events, extraordinary, unheard-of, and almost incredible, if we compare them with the course of the old dispensation of the world (*alten Weltäon*); and this is the common view. But if we measure them according to their number, appearance, and importance, by the infinite fulness of the power of Christ's life, a saving power which restores the whole sinful world even to the resurrection, we must regard them as indeed small beginnings of the revelation of this living power, in which it comes forth as secretly, modestly, and noiselessly as His doctrine in His parables; and we learn the meaning of Christ's saying, by which he led His disciples to estimate this misunderstood phase of His miracles, 'Ye shall do greater works than these' (John xiv. 12). But Christ's miracles served in manifold ways to reveal His life-power to the world in subdued forms of operation. When Christ in these separate acts displays His agency, He lets Himself down to the sensuous level of the world, which only by these examples of His deepest universal agency can gain a perception of that agency itself. He places Himself first of all on a line with the wonder-workers, the exorcists of His time, while He has begun the great work of saving the world, and of expelling the evil spirits from the whole world. By healing the feet of a paralytic, He had to prove that He had previously healed his heart by the forgiveness of his sins. By His wonderful single operations, which powerfully affected the souls of men, He gradually aroused the perception of the susceptible for contemplating the great, eternal miracle which appeared in His own life. But for profane minds the Saviour of the world retired behind the wonder-worker. Often has it been attempted to find in the miracles of Jesus an ostentatious display of Christianity. But a time must come when men will learn to regard them as acts of the humility of Christ. Still, much of the wonderful that is from beneath must be set aside, before the wonderful from above is entirely acknowledged as the first interposition of Christ's eternal life-power for the world. For this power is holy even as the spiritual light of Christ, as His title of Messiah, and as His blessedness in the vision of God; therefore, it veils itself to the captious, while it unveils itself to the susceptible, and even that measure of it which has become manifest in miracle, appears to them as too much. But we must not misapprehend either the one side or the other of the miracles in which this power finds its medium of communication to men.

We might speak of these extraordinary operations of Christ's life without employing the word *miracle* to designate them, and in doing so, clear the way to some extent for those who always imagine that the facts of the kingdom of God are dependent on the designations affixed to them, or on the later definitions of these designations. If, for example, we should call them, in accordance with the phraseology of the Gospels, spiritual primordial powers (*δυνάμεις*) or religious primordial phenomena (*τέρατα* or *σημεῖα*), we should

have the advantage of representing them with these names in their relation to their living origin, the originator of the new dispensation (*Aeon*), and so have designated them as the natural, necessary, and perfectly rational expressions of a new power. But these facts are still, as to their specific nature, rightly designated by the word *miracle* (*Wunder*); namely, when the miracle is regarded as a perfectly novel appearance, which as such calls forth a perfectly novel intuition and state of feeling in the beholders—the highest astonishment and wonder. Now if we have to seek for a developed idea of miracle, it must be almost superfluous to remark, that the Protestant scientific contemplation of the extraordinary facts in the Gospel history, to which the term miracle is applied, cannot be restricted to the definitions of the Church dogmatics. It is confessed that in the course of time these definitions have become more and more unwieldy. But while the free examination must be conducted independently of the maxims of dogmatic science, it must equally be set free from the authority of narrow, worn-out assumptions of natural science, as they have been commonly employed by ‘critical’ theologians against miracles. It is false when dogmatic theology speaks of an absolute removal of the laws of nature, of a sheer suspension of them by miracle;¹ but is equally false when the philosophic culture of the age pretends to a knowledge of absolute laws, which must make a miracle simply impossible.² Such laws of nature are to be called physical gods, or rather divinities; they are perfect contradictions throughout. A law is from the first conditioned by the sphere in which it operates. Now, since nature is an infinitely delicate complex of the most different spheres, it is exceedingly difficult to recognize and correctly define a law of nature as conditioned by its sphere. How different, for instance, the law of nature relative to propagation in the class of mammals and in that of reptiles! How very differently does the law of gravitation act in the region of the double stars and in the region of the earth! But as the law is conditioned in its outward appearance by its sphere, by its relation to space, so also it is conditioned by the course of time to which it belongs by its *æon*. Therefore, in reality, it is always conditioned by the spirit and mind of the Lawgiver. Consequently we cannot fail to perceive that the laws of nature are conditioned by the omnipotent Spirit of the Creator. The Creator is the Interpreter of the law of nature. But surely it cannot be denied that the Creator has spoken by the laws of nature, and He cannot contradict Himself. With this remark, the opponents of miracle

¹ Buddeus terms miracles ‘operationes, quibus naturæ leges, ad ordinem et conservationem totius hujus universi spectantes, re vera suspenduntur.’ See Hahn, *Lehrb. d. chr. Gl.*, p. 24.

² ‘According to Spinoza, God and nature are not two but one; the laws of the latter are the will of the former in its constant realization. Therefore, could anything happen in nature which contradicted its universal laws (as staying the course of the sun, walking on the sea, &c.), this would contradict the nature of God Himself; and to maintain that God does anything against the laws of nature, is the same as maintaining that God acts contrary to His own nature.’—Strauss, *die Christl. Glau-benslehre*, i. 229.

think they have said something that should settle the question. Certainly there can be nothing more conformable to law than the course of nature, since the eternal clearness and consistency of the divine will are expressed in it, since it is an expression of the Spirit, and not the Spirit itself. The life of nature is in fact its conformity to law. If it were not conformable to law, not faithful to its regulations, not inexorably decided in its course, it could not continue in existence, it could not present the sublime counterpart of the Spirit. Its conformity to law is the mirror of the divine freedom. But the Spirit of God would have for ever bound Himself, and been excluded from His own creation, if He had not from the first conditioned its conformity to law with infinite nicety. He Himself would not be God if nature were absolute in its laws—if it were God. Nature too would be shifted from her own proper ground if that great miracle, the act of creation, which bears her phenomena so conformable to law, could not break forth in her midst, and manifest the peculiar nature of her being in a miraculous efflorescence.

Nature may be contemplated in a twofold sequence: its phenomena may be traced from above downwards, or from below upwards. If we take the first path, we shall continually advance from the regions of more indefinite laws, of fluctuating freedom-like life, into the regions of rigid conformity to law, since we shall be penetrating further into the region of the primal and most general features of nature. The migrating bird may be on some occasions deceived by its instinct; but the lightning is thoroughly certain of its path, and belongs proportionably to a much lower region of life. But the further we advance into these low tracts of the most rigid conformity to law, the wider also do the circles of law extend, or so much the more do they bind themselves to fixed conditions, or conceal themselves in the delicate exuberance of variable life. Fire, for instance, is inexorable in its conformity to law; for that reason it generally lies imprisoned in steel and stone. But no sooner do we follow the proper tendency of life in nature, and turn to it from below upwards, than it assumes a quite different form. It appears to us indeed as one of its fundamental laws, that in all its conformity to law it still continues to be nature (*Natura*), that it is always bringing forth, raising, and potentiating itself;¹ and thus from stage to stage it elevates its own laws, forms, and phenomena, and converts them into new ones, and struggles towards glorification in the spirit. It is therefore clear that nature in this direction has throughout a supernatural tendency. She meets on her proud way, as a wonder-worker striving upwards, the wonder-struck theologian, who is as far from free as herself, and performs a miracle entirely the reverse; for he sets aside the laws of the spiritual sphere to seal up the laws of nature by his own gross assumption, since he would make nature the consecrated vehicle of the spirit naturalistic. But nature is also conformable to law, and

¹ [See a passage in Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*, p. 199, 7th ed.—Tr.]

incessant in the boldness with which he hastens towards the free spirit ; she persists in her wonder-working direction. This rests on the simple law, that every power according to its kind can work itself out in nature ; that therefore a higher power can break through the sphere of a lower power, set aside its laws, consume its material, and transform life in it. Thus, for example, the lion rushes as a supernatural principle on the gazelle. It appears, mayhap, an event contrary to nature that so delicate a form of nature should be destroyed and annihilated in its noble conformity to law, whenever the right of this higher power, the lion, is lost sight of. The lion devours the gazelle, but in his deed, in his blood and life, the unnatural act becomes a new nature.

Had the believers in miracles not allowed themselves to be so prejudiced against nature by the appeal made against them to the laws of nature, they must have found the idea of miracle and its future as plainly indicated in nature as the idea and future of man. A grain of corn contains a visible and distinct likeness of a miracle. The grain of corn, in its innermost being, in its germinant power, is a principle of life. This principle of life is brought into operation through nature. But no sooner does it begin to germinate, than it operates as a supernatural power in relation to the substance of the grain of corn. This its supernatural property begins gradually to operate against nature ; it destroys and consumes the natural material which surrounds it, but it removes this old nature-life in order to exhibit it made young again in a new life. Here all the elements of the idea of miracle are present in a symbolic form. Miracle is indeed the well adjusted irruption of a spiritual life-principle into a subordinate life-sphere, an irruption which in its issuing forth as a principle appears *supernatural*, in its decidedness of action is *antinatural*, and in its final issue completes itself in *natural* development.

The image of miracle borrowed from the grain of corn is in one respect imperfect : the seed moves in the circle of a sphere which always remains the same, though at the same time gently rising, while the idea of miracles can be made quite clear only by a succession of life-spheres. We must have heard the spiritual music of the life-spheres, if we would speak of the idea of law, of freedom, and of miracle ; for all these ideas are referable to spherical relations. But as in the religious department, it is said of the righteous man that for him there is no law ; so in the general department of life, the same may be said of the higher life-principles in relation to the lower life-spheres. So the first crystallization is a miracle, since it very decidedly conditions, or in a conditional manner dispenses with, the law of gravitation, which in a lower element-sphere, that of water, prevails unconditioned. The form or law of unconditioned gravity is the globular ; but crystallization makes sport of this first iron rule of gravitation in a thousand ways, when it forms its delicately constructed mathematical figures. The first plant was a miracle which decidedly changed the world in which it grew. And

so it has been correctly said of the animal, that it is a miracle for the vegetable world. Lastly, in MAN the whole of subordinate nature is raised and changed into a specifically higher life-form. He himself, therefore, in this relation to the nature that is subordinate to him, is an eternally speaking image of miracle. In him nature has attained her final aim; she has come in contact with spirit, and in her movements is elevated, consumed, and transformed by his free moral life in conformity with her original destiny.

But now the question arises, whether we have reached the top of the scale of life, when we have reached man simply, man who is of the earth. If there is within humanity only one life-sphere, only one elaboration of one life-principle, there may indeed be always phenomena resembling the miraculous which depend on the difference of powers; but this does not establish the existence of such a region of miracles as the Theocracy and especially Christianity delineates, since the deciding new principle is wanting which must form and support it. But if there is really a succession of stages within humanity—if here again a sphere of specifically higher human life towers above the lower sphere, we must here also expect what meets our eye on all the other stages of life, namely, that the new superior principle breaks through the old sphere with wonderful effect, in order to draw it up into its higher life. But Christianity announces this new higher life-stage not only as *doctrine*, but as *fact*, and in the idea it finds the completest confirmation of its own. The special characteristic of the first human life in its historical appearance, as it was modified by the fall, was the Adamic discord between the spirit and the flesh, and the predominance of the latter over the former. The special characteristic of the second human life in its historical power, that is, in Christ, is the identity of the spirit and the flesh, and the glorification of the flesh under the supremacy of the spirit. The human spirit itself requires this manifestation of the ideal human life in a distinct and decided principle (*Princip.*) But it also requires the actings of this principle—its breaking through the sphere of the first human life, therefore its miracles. In these facts must the new life-principle verify itself as the creative organizing power of a new higher world.

When persons are accustomed to regard nature as only one sphere, and to allow the world of men to coincide with this one circle of nature, it excites the conception of a boundless Mongolian steppe, in which nothing more extraordinary can occur than the ever appearing and ever vanishing of the same sights and the same faces. But the more familiar we become with the succession of spheres in nature, and with the heavenly ladder of the aeons in the history of the world, the more we shall find in the great central miracle—the life of Christ—the necessity established of the several miracles which form its historical periphery. And the more we can estimate the contrast between the heavenly spiritual glory of the life of Christ, and the shattered, old human world, in all its magnitude, the more we shall expect these miracles of Christ to

stand forth in bold relief. Thus, then, the doctrine of the *miracles* of Christ is most intimately connected with the doctrine of His *Person*.¹ Where the former appears mutilated, we may justly infer a mutilation of the latter, and the reverse. The truth of this assertion may be proved from the fact, that the various discrepancies in the doctrine of miracles can very easily be traced back to corresponding discrepancies in the doctrine of the person of Christ. Whoever decidedly rejects the uniqueness of the person of Christ, will not be able to recognize the uniqueness of His works. The difficulty which ‘modern culture’ has with the miracles of Jesus, is connected with a decline in the knowledge of the Son of the Virgin. When the root of the life of Christ is no longer estimated in its wonderful singularity, how can the golden fruit of miracles be sought for on the top of the tree? In fact every one-sidedness in Christology is reflected by a one-sidedness in the theory of miracles. The older orthodox doctrine of Christ did not at all times estimate the full value of His humanity. It often represented His becoming a man as a humiliation, and at the same time lost sight of the individuality of His being. Christ’s humanity often appeared as an organic form, or the more concrete human approach to His divinity. One consequence of this view was, that the miracles were regarded simply as works of divine Omnipotence. On this supposition faith in miracles was, in appearance, infinitely easy. The explanation was always at hand—Christ can do all things because He is God. But not to say that with this view the presence of God in nature was regarded as the sway of an absolute will within the circle of the most exact conformity to law, it was at the same time forgotten that Christ as the Son was aware that His own agency was throughout conditioned by that of the Father (John v. 19); moreover, that He communicated to His own disciples the power of working miracles. According to this view, Christ was not perfectly incorporated with humanity; and the same might be affirmed of His miracles, which would thus form only a conservatory of the choicest plants, transplanted from heaven, and delighting us as images of heaven, but never naturalized on earth. They would only attest the one thought that God is omnipotent, and willing to aid us with His omnipotence.

While a one-sided supranaturalism, therefore, makes an exotic conservatory of the miracles of Jesus, the rationalist doctrine of Christ metamorphoses them into a bramble-bush. When Jesus is regarded simply as the son of Joseph, who, at the most, manifested the power of God in a peculiar manner, and fulfilled a mission from God, such a personality is not strong enough to concentrate the miracles of the Gospel history into an overpowering unity, and to make them proceed from Himself as the natural manifestations of the power of His wonderful life. But there they stand; and they must spring forth from the soil of the Gospel history as best they can: from the extraordinary power of Christ; from the ordination

¹ [See Note 8.]

of Providence ; or even from the favour of chance, from the elements of medical science, from magnetism, from popular credulity, from the embellishments of fiction, and lastly, even from the inaccuracies of the New Testament language. It is natural that such a wonderful soil should bear a thicket of miracles into which the rationalist shepherd is unwilling to lead his flock, since he is afraid they should lose their wool in the bushes, and which therefore he passes by himself as best he can. The spiritualist, alarmed and troubled at the sight of this thicket, warns us, with the looks of honest Eckhart, not to lose our way in the dangerous wood, but rather to adopt a logic which sets the outward and the inward, the letter and the spirit, in eternal contrariety.

But if there is a distinct recognition of the great miracle, namely, the uniqueness of the life of Christ, His separate miracles assume altogether a different aspect. They then form so many branches of a lofty, vigorous tree, and appear quite simply as manifestations of His nature, as His works. When we look at the height of the tree, and keep in our eye the strength of its trunk, its branches appear to us, not as the ponderous crown of an oak, but rather as the cheerful, graceful summit of a palm-tree ; they seem to us as towering, slender, waving branches sporting in the wind. Should not the tree of life of the new aeon be able to bear this crown without breaking down, and put forth the flowers which adorn it from its own internal vital power ? Let it not be forgotten how high the tree rises towards heaven, how deep and wide its roots spread through the life of all humanity ! When a young alpine stream, under the impulse of its great destiny, hastens down into the wide world, it shows signs of the region of its origin ; waterfalls and passages forced through rocks testify of the original freshness of its power. But when Christianity rushes down from the heavenly heights of the God-man into the low-lying tracts of a human world, nature-enthralled and sunk in misery, and in its first irruption carries away with it the great stone of the sepulchre, here, as in the alpine scenery, the second miracle is not greater than the first ; rather is it purely natural in relation to the first. If the understanding is here disposed to take offence, the question must be asked, whether it regards the separate miracles as too little or too great in relation to the central miracle ? Many persons who have seen the falls of the Rhine have said that they found them small in relation to their previous conception. These persons, at all events, ascribe something, though erroneously, to the reality ; while there are others who cannot imagine the half, at all events the full reality. Everything here depends on the estimate formed of the power which calls a phenomenon into life. The greater the power is thought to be, the easier is the conception of the appearance found to be ; but the more highly the appearance is estimated, the less adequate is the power. We have turned in our contemplation to the power. In the centre of the world's history, the principle of principles, the light of lights, the life of the living, and therefore also the power of powers,

has appeared to us ; the one miracle, which causes many miracles to appear as the natural utterances of a new and higher life-power.¹

The miracle of the life of Jesus is one with the miracle of the actual vision (*Selbstanschauung*) of God. Whoever would explain this miracle to us, must be able to give us the assurance that he is of a pure heart, or that he sees God, or that he surveys the whole world in all its manifoldness as an ideal unity. The saint who beholds God, sees, in the very act of beholding, the nature of His essence ; to him the opposition of nature and miracle has become clear in their perfected harmony in God Himself. But whoever has not attained to this elevation, must necessarily regard the nature of God predominantly as a miracle, and accordingly must recognize its miraculous operations as the natural expressions of its essence. The same holds good of the works of Christ, in whom the self-revelation of God has appeared to us. Christ is the miraculous in the centre of nature : out of its relation to Him, even nature is miraculous ; but in relation to Him, even miracle is natural. The Christian Gospel miracle must always find its 'natural' explanation in the miracle of the life of Christ. Christ Himself exhibits the completed mediation between the unconditioned omnipotence of God and finite conditioned nature—therefore the mediation of miracles.

The possibility of miracles is correctly proved in a twofold way : either by an appeal to the divine omnipotence, or to the idea of an accelerated natural process. On the one hand, it is argued, With God nothing is impossible ; on the other, God changes every year water into wine, only by a slower process than at Cana. When, therefore, *miracle* is described as an act of God's omnipotence, we have named its deepest ground, its possibility ; but its actual occurrence is not thereby explained. It is not even explained by representing that the will of the performer of the miracle has become one with the will of God. For our will may become one with the will of God even in the most profound resignation. But in the performance of a miracle, not only does man become one with God in the depths of the divine will in general, but God also becomes one with man in the special act in which man performs the miraculous with supernatural power derived from God. When, therefore, we are confronted by Omnipotence, by the will of the Almighty, and consequently are deeply moved by the infinite great probability of the miracle, the question still returns, Will God perform a miracle which positively encroaches on miraculous nature ? On the other hand, a miracle can as little be regarded as a mere extraordinary operation of the performer upon nature, when we speak of an acceleration of nature. There can be no question, indeed, that as, on the one hand, a miracle is rooted in the omnipotence of God,

¹ Neander, p. 138. ['Since Jesus was verily an incarnation of the Godhead, miraculous works in His life were only becoming and natural.'—Young's *Christ of History*, p. 267. Similarly, and quite logically, almost all modern defenders of the miracles. This argument is but the more accurate statement and amplification of one of Augustine's suggestive utterances : 'Mirum nonesse debet a Deo factum miraculum ; . . . magis gaudere quam mirari debemur.'—In *Joan. Tract. xvii. 1.*—ED.]

so, on the other hand, it celebrates its appearance in the accelerated process of nature. If therefore we turn to this conception of the accelerated process of nature, we certainly find that nature in its processes performs pure miracles—that it changes water into wine, wine into blood, blood into milk; and this fact shows us how plainly the miracles of the kingdom of God are reflected in similar national phenomena. These thousandfold similarities give us, therefore, again a lively impression of the near possibility of miracles. We think that such a process of nature needs only to be in some degree accelerated, and a miracle will be the result.¹ But if it should come to this phenomenon of an accelerated process of nature, we must have at any rate the principle of the process, its germ. All processes of nature arise from principles, which in their ultimate grounds must be regarded as the thoughts and operations of God. If now every common process of nature presupposes a principle, much more must such a one exist for an accelerated process: for a miracle of healing, a decisive healing power; for the change of water into wine, the factor of the formation of wine, ‘the vine with its branches.’² Accordingly the idea of an accelerated process of nature, strictly considered, exhibits only the course of a miracle when it is already decided in principle, just as the appeal to the omnipotence of God exhibits only the general power of the miracle, without deciding that the miracle shall actually take place.

We are now, therefore, placed between two possibilities of miracle, and yet not justified in exhibiting these combined as giving us the actual occurrence of the miracle. Between these possibilities, rather, the question still arises respecting the living centre which exhibits the miraculous power of God in the actual miraculous fact, so that it can pass imperceptibly into the accelerated processes of nature.

This centre we found in the life of Jesus. The miraculous reality of His life must, in accordance with its nature, express itself in miraculous operations. In Him the mediation between God and nature has appeared complete and effulgent; therefore He exhibits omnipotence operating in the midst of nature without violating nature in its essence, and exhibits what is conformable to nature in the divine life, without obscuring the divine freedom.³

¹ See Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 109; Olshausen, *Commentary on the Gospels*, iii. 363. The latter appeals to the expression of Augustine—Ipse fecit vinum in nuptiis, qui omni anno hoc facit in vitibus. Illud autem non miramur, quia omni anno fit; assiduitate amisit admirationem.

² Strauss has justly required for the change of the water into wine at Cana, the factor of the vine; but when he supposes that this vine must be a vegetable one, his thoughts wander among the vineyards of the nature-æon, while here we have to consider the action of the vine in the spirit-æon.

³ J. Müller, in his programme *De miraculorum Jesu Christi naturâ et necessitate*, p. 8, &c., impugns the views of the older theologians of the Evangelical Church, according to which the miracles of Christ were deduced from His divine nature. He justly draws attention to the passages in which our Lord appeals to the Father in His performance of miracles in order to impugn the explanation of miracles from a one-sided activity of the omnipotence of God in Christ. But when he remarks, ‘neque ad rem quidquam interest horum scriptorum nonnullos humanæ proxime Christi naturæ miracula assignare; per communicationem idiomatum enim hujus divinæ virtutis participem factam illam esse volunt,’ and further, ‘quod autem miracula

This indissoluble union between the miraculous One and His miracles must be verified in a twofold way: first, because we see in Christ, as well as in His wonder-working, all the elements that make up the conception of a miracle realized in the most powerful form; and also, because in all His miraculous works we plainly find again the christological characteristic, their relation to the life of Christ.

Miracle has above appeared to us as the decided irruption of a mediated (*vermittelten*) principle of a higher life-sphere into the old form of a lower one, with the tendency to take up this lower sphere into the higher. Now, if we fix our eye on Christ as a principle, He appears to us in this relation as the kingly principle of all universal principles. Every subordinate principle is, no doubt, an original power, a product of God's creative operation, a marvellous witness of God's nearness; but Christ as a principle is one with God's manifestation in the world, with His highest operation, the principle of the creation of a new world. But this principle is in the highest degree conformable to nature, for it is mediated with infinite abundance. Every lesser principle is mediated by some corresponding course of nature; but the life of Christ is mediated by the whole antecedent course of the world. This mediated method of Christ is His nature. Therefore, since the nature of Christ was more mediated or prepared for than any other being, we can discover in His life the genuine stamp of all naturalness, the highest fulfilling of all nature-life. But by nature, according to its power and destiny, is simply the glory or the power of the divine Spirit over all nature-life. His life is therefore so far supernatural in its essence and its operations. It is essentially His destiny to operate supernaturally or metaphysically, to free the creature from vanity, to transform its life of bondage by the life of the Spirit. For this reason, in that antinaturalness by which the higher nature takes up the lower nature, He breaks through the limits of the old course of nature and the world, first of all with the miracle of His peculiar birth, and afterwards by the copious operations of His redeeming power. His life puts to death the life or the nature of the old Adam throughout the world, and especially in this sense are His opera-

factitavit, id ei certo tempore concessum est singulari dei dono, quo ad provinciam Messianam administrandam instructus est,—he strikes into another direction which has been successfully pursued by Nitzsch, Twesten, Neander, Ullmann, and others, for the solution of the problem of miracles. See Nitzsch, *System of Christian Doctrine*, p. 83 (Clark); Twesten, *Dogmatik*, vol. i. p. 380; Neander and Ullmann, in the passages quoted above. Also, might there not be a propriety in receiving with Christ a *singulare Dei donum?* When the author further shows that God stands in presence of nature in absolute majesty and freedom, he has admirably described the principle of miracles; and it requires only to give prominence to the incarnation of this God, in order to give to the principle described its concrete form. [Scripture gives us to understand that the Spirit is the agent of all divine operations. When, therefore, it is pressed, as in the present day it is too frequently and exclusively pressed, that the miracles were wrought by the Spirit, it should be kept distinctly in view that this Spirit is the Spirit of Christ Himself, the Spirit proceeding from the Father and from the Son. Correct views of the immediate power by which the miracles of Christ were wrought, introduce into the apologetic argument from miracles a modification which will be felt by any one who undertakes the argument. Very instructive on this point is Owen, *On the Spirit*, ii. 3, 4.—ED.]

tions antinatural. These operations have seized human and earthly life in its depths, and in these depths are working out a great regeneration, which is to break forth resplendent from the ashes of the old world. It was in the nature of the case for these operations to disclose themselves in direct, immediate forms; in signs symbolical of Christ's general agency; in miracles which appeared antinatural to men, in proportion as the old form of the world was held to be the only normal one, and of eternal validity. But as the life of Christ, notwithstanding its spirituality, or rather in this very spirituality, appears as a perfected, beautiful new nature, so it is also with His miraculous operations. They all issue and complete themselves in quick natural processes, the results of which appear in new, delightful forms of life. Thus His breaking through the old world, by which He advances to the last judgment and the end of the world, will have for its consequences a new world.

All these constituents of the conception of miracle must be more or less prominent in the single miraculous works of Christ. First of all, the constituent of *mediation*. The need of a miracle is a *constituent* corresponding to the principle for performing miracles, and is the occasion when Christ receives an intimation from the Father to work in unity with Him creatively, that is, to perform a miracle. Indeed, the constituent for effecting the great saving miracle of the world's salvation is ever present to the Lord. But the occasions for allowing the fruits of this redemption to make their appearance in special operations, and for the signs of the transforming power of this redemption, the omens of the future glorification of the world, to shine forth, are more rare (Luke iv. 25-27; John xi. 4). There are single moments in which a definite form of the world's misery and the world's Redeemer in His historical pilgrimage meet, we might say, one another on so narrow a bridge, and so exactly face to face, that they must fight with one another, or rather the misery must collapse and vanish before the Redeemer.

These constituent elements are therefore mediated equally with the life itself. The most general mediating is the faith of those who need relief. This faith is the peculiar organ of susceptibility for the miraculous power of Christ—the divine token, in fact, by which the occasion of working a miracle is indicated to Him. But if any one is disposed to make this susceptibility the special factor of the relief granted, and thus to account for the miracle by the faith of miracles, in such a case he would ascribe to the sufferer a greater faith and a greater power than to Christ Himself. But faith as such is generally no more than a susceptibility, which is distinguished from fanaticism by its knowing with certainty that it is met by a positive operation of God. If, therefore, it is altogether erroneous to make faith in its isolated position a worker of miracles without the co-operating power of God, it is also perfectly monstrous to pretend that there are believers who beget this miraculous help out of themselves, when they stand supplianting before the Lord, when He answers their confidence, and receives thanks for the help

given. Even Christ Himself worked not in an isolated position, though He had within Himself a positive miraculous power, but in conjunction with the Father (John x. 41) directing a look of confidence towards Him. But this mediating of miracles appears to us to vanish when we look at the miracles of Christ performed at a distance ; likewise in His healing of demoniacs ; but, lastly and chiefly, in His miraculous operations on nature. But even here we see traces of mediation gradually emerging from the darkness, as we direct our eye to the inner relations of the world, and estimate them higher than is commonly done in relation to the outward phenomena. When Christ healed the possessed child of the Canaanitish woman, the channel through which the operation reached the child is plainly traceable : it was one of the disposition, sunk deep in the heart of the supplianting mother. Her agitated soul with one hand laid hold of the Lord, and with the other of her child, and thus formed a living affinity—an electrical conductor by which the lightning of healing flashed from the heart of Christ into the heart of her child. In the world of clairvoyance delicate streams of fire and tracks of light have been seen, which were formed between separated human souls, so that they thought of one another vividly, and have been occupied with one another : these are spiritual bridges which love, anxiety, remembrance, and especially intercessory prayer, have thrown across spaces of outward separation, and traverse. These communications correspond entirely with a delicate estimate of the dynamical relations of the world.

But not to insist on these, we cannot, at all events, doubt of the living movement of the mightiest powers between hearts which stand in the most intimate and vital relation to one another. But this movement suffices us as a spiritual pathway for the healing powers of the Lord when they have to act at a distance. Thus the nobleman at Capernaum became a conductor of Christ's healing power for his son ; and the Gentile centurion, with his strong faith, was a mediating organ for his servant. But when our Lord had to deal with demoniacs, this mediation lay in a power which, in diseased persons of this class, is generally active with a morbid development, and a more intense energy—a power of psychical foreboding. Of the nature of demoniacal suffering we do not here speak. But it is a fact which occurs among the nervous and insane of our own time, as well as in the case of the demoniacs in the Gospel history, that in their intensified power of foreboding, they are capable of divining the dispositions and intentions which the persons immediately about them entertain. They are in a morbid state of psychical agitation, and in a closer affinity than healthy persons to the psychical movements of the bystanders. Especially have they an extraordinary sensitiveness for states of mind which are in contrast to their own. As *clairvoyantes* can be disturbed by the nearness of impure characters, so demoniacs and insane persons often become excited by the approach of saintly characters. They feel the operation of a power which even at a distance comes into

collision with their state, and presses punitively on the secret consciousness of the psychical terror with which commonly their state of mental bondage is connected. Thus the demoniac whom Jesus met with in the synagogue at Capernaum could not endure His presence (Mark i. 23), but cried out against Him. That the demoniacs were the first who proclaimed Him as the Messiah, may be accounted for from the activity and perceptive vigour of their intensified power of foreboding; not simply because this power of foreboding brought them into a peculiar relation with the consciousness of Christ, but because it also formed the same relation between them and the secret thoughts of their times. That Jesus was the Messiah, was the public secret of His time, from the beginning of His ministry. John's annunciation of Him had already taken place; His disciples indulged distinct hopes of the manifestation of His Messianic glory, and the people were agitated by the fluctuations of foreboding that He was the promised One. But the dark antipathy of the hierarchy hung like a threatening thunder-cloud over against this dawn in men's minds. No one ventured to commit himself by the public and decided recognition of Christ. The insane naturally took the lead; they proclaimed aloud the obscure mystery which they found in the breasts of their contemporaries. Fools and children speak the truth; so here the acclamations of the children soon followed the cries of the demoniacs. In addition to them, Christ was proclaimed by poor mendicants, who had nothing to lose; and by the people in a mass, who in masses always feel strongly. When, therefore, the demoniacs had an excited feeling and foreboding of the dignity of Christ,—when by their recklessness they anticipated the people in the publication of His name, a mediation was thus formed for the miraculous aid of Christ. As borderers on the kingdom of spirits they were raised above the ban of the Sanhedrim by the peculiar sacredness of their calamitous state; and as confessors of Jesus, they were peculiarly the objects of His compassion.

But no such mediation of the miracles of Christ appears at first sight to be given in the case of the dead whom He restored to life; yet, on carefully considering the circumstances, we shall find that there is a mediation, or rather a double one. The three dead persons whom Christ restored, even when dead were held by strong bonds in the vicinity of life;—the daughter of Jairus, by the loud mourning of the parental house; the young man at Nain, by the inconsolable grief of his mother; and lastly, Lazarus, not merely by the ceaseless yearning with which his sisters waited for the Lord, but also by the unsatisfied expectation with which he himself had sunk into the grave. Even though dead, therefore, these three still experienced the strong attraction towards life on this side the grave. But as spirits, they understood the voice of the Prince of spirits. The modes of mediating the miracles of Christ in His operations on external nature are hardest to discover. Here also the connecting links have been lost for the most part, because sufficient

account has not been taken of the co-operation of hearts. This applies especially to the miracles of food and drink which Jesus wrought. How very much has it been the practice to pass over, in these miracles, the mental states of the persons for whom they were wrought! In many a dissertation on the miracle at Cana, the exclamation, 'They have no wine! no wine!' meets us at every turn; and some theological treatises upon it handle the whole question after so grossly material a fashion, so utterly without a surmise of the significance of the spiritual transaction in this history, that one would think they were composed in a tavern, or meant to lay the scene of the narrative in a public-house! But how could these miracles have a New Testament power and significance, if they were not performed in the element of emotional life (*Gemuithsleben*) and of the sphere of faith? We do not intend to enlarge on this remark here, but reserve the development for the sequel. In the stilling of the storm on the lake of Gennesaret, the mediating consisted in this, that first of all the hearts of the disciples, as the firstlings of the new humanity, were laid at rest before the winds and waves were stilled. The cursing of the fig-tree was mediated by that presentiment of the judgment awaiting Jerusalem and the end of the world, which so deeply moved Christ in His last days.

It will be understood that the supernatural, which is operative in all Christ's miracles, must be always and immediately looked for in His divine life-power. This life-power, in the case where Christ performed a miracle, is identical with the omnipotence of God; for He performed such an act only according to the will of the Father, and in unity with Him. It was the overpowering agency of the sovereign principle which was placed in the centre of the world, in order to destroy its corruption and effect its glorification. But the expressions of the power of Christ, as they differ in different miracles, so also the forms they assume are different. To the leprous Christ presented Himself as positive purity, the absolute power of all purification; to the deaf as the ear-forming word; and, to the dead, as the positive life-giving life. And as Christ in such agency becomes one with the Father, so is the disposition in which He accomplishes His miracle one with Him. His word is the fructifying principle with which the receptive faith takes in the victorious life-power which is destined to effect the miracle in its own life-circle. The believers in miraculous power therefore received, in the moment of the performance of the miracle, by a sympathetic elevation of their disposition, a share in the noblemindedness of Christ, and in this moment of their highest nearness to heaven the miracle became incorporated with their life.

But in all cases an old naturalness, either a dark form or a fettering limitation, or an evil of the old world which has become nature, is broken through and taken away by the miraculous agency of Christ. At one time, it is the roaring storm; at another time, it is water in the colourless form which it takes as a defect in contrast with the wine; and at a third time, it is the grave. This character of destruction is most prominent in the cursing of the fig-tree.

But, lastly, we also see that all the miracles of Jesus bear the impress of true miracle, because they enter nature with creative, liberating, formative power, and complete themselves as natural processes. The men whom Christ heals or restores to life come forward again, as forms restored to this world, in all their native freshness. To the daughter of Jairus food is given to eat (Mark v. 43). Lazarus soon after his resurrection is found among the guests at a feast. Our Lord causes this subsidence of miracle into natural life to appear even in effecting His own miracles. The blind man whom Christ cured at Bethsaida (Mark viii. 22), after Christ's first operation, exclaimed, 'I see men as trees walking !' Visible objects still appear before his eyes in indistinct outline, nor did he perfectly recover his sight till Christ had touched his eyes a second time. The Lord seems carefully to have given prominence to this natural side of the cures He effected, and to have drawn, so to speak, a veil round the strictly miraculous operation by availng Himself more or less of natural operations. Even the word by which He usually effected His work, is not in itself alone to be regarded as a mere unsensuous expression of the spirit. As in its meaning it is a divine thought, so outwardly it is a thunderbolt of the soul's life—a powerful psychical act, inflaming the hearts and agitating the organs of the susceptible. Such a word of Christ is, in miniature, an image of the creative universal agency of God by which He created the world—that infinite expression of God, which inwardly was altogether His sun-bright thought and will, and outwardly a mysterious, darkly brooding, immeasurably rich fulness of life—that creative basis of the world which now appeared in Him in individual personality. But the nature-side of His miraculous agency was more striking when He touched the sufferers or laid hold of them by the hand. Such contact must have been, in the case of the leprous especially, a revolting operation (Matt. viii. 3). With such an one Christ placed Himself in the relation of defilement. He exposed Himself thereby to the danger, according to the Levitical law, of being excluded from the congregation as an unclean person ; He even hazarded His life for the sake of curing the leprous when He touched them. This moral operation itself, in its living power to touch the soul, was for the diseased like a flash of lightning from heaven. But it is remarkable, that Jesus never went beyond touching. Though, according to the account in Mark's Gospel (vi. 13), the disciples of Jesus often anointed the sick with oil, and thus restored them to health, yet we are not warranted by this circumstance to conclude that Jesus Himself used such means. The disciples, with their weaker miraculous power, appear to have depended on a more natural act of healing ; as, according to the direction of James, the elders of the Church were obliged to do at a later period. In fact, besides touching, imposition of the hands, or laying hold of the hand of the diseased, in which the complete miraculous power of His holy hand was manifested, Christ only employed one physical means repeatedly,

one distinctly individual, a natural bodily means—His spittle. The ancients attribute to the saliva a sure healing power, especially for many disorders of the eyes; an opinion which is still held in our own times.¹ But Christ appears to make this means the vehicle of a higher power. If the personality of Christ is regarded according to its peculiar significance as the life-giving life, as positive healthfulness, we may venture to expect that every bodily substance or quality which has proved itself elsewhere in any degree curative, will be found again in His life in the highest potency, and, as an expression of that life, will exhibit the highest healing efficiency. But Jesus applied the same means in different ways. He healed (according to Mark vii. 33) a deaf and dumb man by putting His fingers in his ears, and then, after spitting on His finger, touching his tongue.² In the case of the blind man at Bethsaida, the spittle seems to have been directly applied to the eyes of the blind, and followed by the imposition of hands (viii. 22). When He cured the man born blind at Jerusalem (John ix.), He spat on the ground and made a paste, with which He anointed the eyes of the blind, and ordered him to go and wash in the pool of Siloam. We have here again an advanced application of the spittle: the paste which He spread on the eyes of the blind, as something more than a momentary application, and the time spent in going to the pool at Siloam, during which it remained, constituted this advanced use of it. The washing in the pool of Siloam, which the afflicted man had to perform, seems to have been only a symbolical act in which, with his faith, his cure was to be completed. At all events, it was otherwise with the spittle. The repetition of its application plainly shows that it was used as a means; and although its application does not do away with the miraculous character of the cures in which Jesus made use of it, yet it shows how He was inclined to conceal, in a degree, His miraculous acts,—to soften the sublime abruptness of their direct operation by a connection with some form, more or less known, of the extraordinary art of healing.³ It was a little thing, an act of condescension, for Him to perform these single miracles; while the people were astonished at them as the highest expressions of His life. This induced Him to make His healing operations approach a natural form, and to clothe them in poor, flat, and strange forms, in order to bring the exalted power that revealed itself in Him into communication with the life of the world. Yet He could not have given His miracles this form, if He had found in it no healing power whatever. For this very reason, this form of Christ's miraculous cures, the application of His spittle, was

¹ See Fleck, *die Vertheidigung des Christenthums*, p. 150; Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 81; Suetonius, *Vesp.* vii.

² The ears appear to have been touched with one hand and the tongue with the other simultaneously; and this operation seems to mark a peculiar influence.

³ [Ewald (*Christus*, p. 224, 4th ed.) notices in this connection how our Lord sometimes inquired into the symptoms of the bodily disease. All these forms of 'mediation' prove to his mind 'that His human acting was bound to the universal laws of the divine order, and that this He would in no wise arrogantly violate.'—ED.]

peculiarly suited to make what was miraculous in His operations appear as natural, and what was natural in His life appear as miraculous.¹ This nature-side of His miraculous power meets us most strikingly in the history of the woman suffering from the issue of blood, who was healed by the believing touch of His garment. The Lord had not conversed with her; yet He was aware that He had been touched, and that by this contact a cure had been effected, for He declared that ‘virtue had gone out’ of Him (Luke viii. 46). Does not the healing power of Christ here appear almost in a pathological form as a suffering? Offence has been taken at this narrative. And yet it only manifests the most delicate feeling for life in a personality most rich in life. The same Master of psychical life, who had a perfectly developed sense for every sympathy and antipathy that approached Him, could not help perceiving the agitation or hurried respiration of a sufferer who touched Him under the highest excitement of pain, and at the same time of confidence, as one needing aid; and when He blessed in His Spirit the sufferer without knowing her as an individual, the contact and the miraculous aid perfectly coincided. It is not said that He did not freely part with this healing power, that He had been robbed of it; for as soon as the Lord felt Himself touched by a suffering, He freely entered into it with His sympathy.² But when He wished to cause the woman who had been cured to come forward openly on her own account, He rightly declared that virtue had gone out of Him. It was needful to make the matter public: hitherto the cure had been as it were a stolen one, and the woman remained at least suffering from false shame. At all events, Christ’s language informs us that the virtue which proceeded from Him, was to be regarded as a virtue connected with the nature of His life. Hence by this passage we are led to consider a question which in modern times has been often agitated, namely, How far the miraculous cures performed by Christ are akin to the cures effected by animal magnetism. Some have attached great importance to this affinity; others have been apprehensive ‘lest by this similarity the agency of Jesus should be brought too near the profane; others, again, have admitted a greater or less analogy between the two methods of healing. Thus much is certain: if in general the power of magnetism belongs to the flesh and blood of human nature, then Christ also has appropriated this power. But if, on

¹ Considering the means of cure objectively, we must at all events distinguish between the animal healing power residing in the saliva and the psychical healing power communicated through the intention of the worker of the miracle, perhaps through His breath. If the ancients, embracing both these elements in their concrete unity, contemplated the miraculous element as the decisive one, it does not follow that they denied the natural one.

² This narrative gives no support to the supposition of ‘involuntary healings.’ The passages which Strauss has adduced (Matt. xiv. 36; Mark iii. 10, vi. 56; Luke vi. 19), with the remark that Jesus in these instances did not expend self-active powers, but must have involuntarily allowed them to have been carried off, *expressly assert the contrary*. ‘They besought Him that they might touch if it were but the border of His garment; and as many as touched Him were made whole’ (Mark vi. 56).

the other hand, all flesh and blood has attained in Christ's person its complete spiritualization, this also is true especially of magnetism, and of the application of its power. If we have first learned to estimate the ascending lines of powers (over against the descending line of ideas) in the world, and found that these same powers reappear in all the stages of life, but in ever new transformations and higher potencies, then also the relation of Christ's healing power to magnetism must gradually be made clear. The very term Animal Magnetism expresses that gradation ; it marks especially the power of the magnet, as it re-appears in a more elevated form in the animal kingdom. If we follow the hint which lies in these terms, we shall be led to the contemplation of a scale of magnetic power, of which the lowest degree lies deep in the elements, and the highest must be revealed in the power of Christ's nature. The light of the atmosphere seems to reappear in the earthly elements as electricity. Electricity is no doubt an elevated power in the magnet. Then magnetism comes forward in the animal sphere as a power working soul-like, of which the operations border on magic. Now, when this power appears elevated again in the human region as a peculiar talent in the life of certain individuals, this is no longer mere animal magnetism, but is exalted into the human. But this power experiences a new consecration in the free spiritual activity of a devout worker of miracles, or of a prophet who acts under a sense of the eternal. Lastly, if it comes again to view in Christ, it must appear in His life according to its nature, not only with the greatest fulness, but in perfect unity with the operations of the Divine Spirit. It also appears here altogether as nature, but as completely ideal, as a pure agency, as a perfect vehicle of the Spirit. Thus, then, in Christ the powers of all the stages of nature are elevated and glorified. He is not only in a metaphorical, but also in a dynamic sense, the light of the world ; the lightning which hereafter at His appearing will shine from the east even to the west ; the unity of those four divergent forms of life or animal images which symbolically represent the great model-forms of life ; the Man in whom humanity is concentrated, and therefore in whom every human endowment appears in its fairest bloom ; the prophet who stands and acts in the fulness of the powers of God ; finally, He Himself, the God-man, who performs a miracle as little as any other man when God has not indicated it, but also then with the complete certainty with which God Himself works it. Thus, then, the healing power with which Christ accomplishes His work is a power related to, and brought into combination with, the innermost life of nature in all its stages, and therefore verifies itself in its operations as the healing power of the diseased human world ; and its product is a new nature.

Thus, as on the one hand the genuine miracle is to be recognized in all the works of Christ as well as in His life, so on the other hand the christological stamp is found in all His miracles, and again especially in the miraculous momenta of His life itself.

The miraculous momenta in the life of Jesus present themselves as a pure linked succession of stages in the unfolding of His christological glory. In His wonderful birth of the Virgin, first of all, life existed as a positive life-power, as pure power ; that is to say, an individuality which in its flesh and blood exhibits the completed harmony with the universe, which is born of the Spirit and is one with the Spirit, and, as the power of the Spirit, has power over life. His self-comprehension in human development begins this life of power, and reaches at length the climax of perfect spirit-consciousness with the baptism in the Jordan. Here His individual unfolding in spirit was completed. But, after that, the capability of this life unfolds itself in the soul-life of Christ, and the bloom of this festivity of the soul bursts forth at the transfiguration. Lastly, by the fact of the resurrection the corporeity of Christ was borne aloft out of the region of the old nature and the realm of death into the imperishable ; the body was borne aloft in the power of the Spirit, and made thoroughly spiritual and spirit-like, while its life-power and vitality is not only maintained, but perfected in its spiritualization. The ascension is, in the first place, not so much a new miracle as the full verification of the miracle of the resurrection, the highest evidence of glorification or of completed spiritualization to which the life of Christ has been elevated. It becomes a new miracle as it introduces and represents the session of Christ at the right hand of God. But this again manifests itself in three momenta, which run parallel with the momenta of the individual glorification of Christ while they exhibit His universal glory. With the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, Christ gains a universal consciousness in His Church. This universal power of the Spirit over the earth will one day bring its constantly regenerating operation in the souls of men into festive manifestation, when the Church of Christ attains to the full spiritual beauty of His kingdom. After that, His individual resurrection will unfold itself finally in the glorification of the world which ensues on the world's judgment at the general resurrection. The first moment (*moment*) of this universal unfolding of the glory of Christ, consists, therefore, in the revelation of His dominion over the spiritual life of humanity ; in the second appears His dominion over the souls of men, the completion of the victory of Christ's sympathy over the sympathy of evil, which is evinced in a great Christian inspiration of humanity ; the third moment reveals His power over all flesh.

It is undeniable that all the momenta of miracles in which the life of Christ is unfolded are throughout christological ; that is, they perfectly correspond to the conception of the life of Christ and its significance for the world.¹ When, therefore, we have repre-

¹ [This is the idea of Westcott's suggestive little book, *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*. 'The miracles of the Gospel are *not* isolated facts ; they are *not* vain repetitions. In meaning, as well as in time, they lie between the incarnation and the ascension. . . . Each (kind of miracle) is needful for the complete representation of the life of Christ,' &c., pp. 6-9. The book is full of most valuable aids towards grasping the miracles as a whole, and is pervaded by the sober and reverent spirit which characterizes all the productions of this useful writer.—ED.]

sented the miraculous acts of Christ as the natural emanations of His miraculous nature, it is evident that they must disclose the same christological nature. And so we find it. In fact, they generally present the most distinct correspondences to the separate christological stages in the development of Christ's life. It is our business to point out these correspondences, and to render as conspicuous as possible the general ideas which lie at the basis of the miracles of Jesus.

If now, with this view, we refer the different kinds of Christ's miracles to the different stages of His life's development, it cannot be supposed that Christ performed a peculiar class of miracles only in a particular form of the development of His power; rather it is implied that in every miracle the whole life of Christ was active when we designate them all generally as christological. But the matter in question here is, that we contemplate the general christological nature of the miracles of Jesus in the sharp distinctness of their type, and that we therefore contemplate them as phenomena belonging to the progressive development of His life and work.

It is a radical evil of the old æon, that nature has circumvented the spirit of man through his guilt, has gained the upper hand, and stands over him like a menacing giant. According to the ideal relations of the world, it ought to be otherwise. In a life of innocence, the spirit would prove its harmony with nature and its power over it. Instinct, like a prophet, announces this mastery of the spirit over nature, as it appears with a beautiful living constancy in animal life. But for a long time fallen man appears to give the lie to these prophecies. The dog falls into the water and swims; but a man falls in and is drowned. But he is drowned, not by his bodily weight, not by the natural relation of his body to the water, but by the consternation which misleads him to sink into destruction by a morbid excitement, instead of balancing himself on the waves in victorious self-possession.

When, therefore, Christ walks on the stormy sea, the quintessence of the miracle consists in the perfect divine equanimity of His spirit. He is, first of all, quite free from that corrupt act of swimming practised by the natural man. But His pure vital courage in the water is connected with the vital feeling of His organism, which is the crown of all human organisms. The relation of bodies to the water is infinitely various. There are some swimmers that sink deep, and others that hold themselves high.

The Prince by birth of land and sea walks through the waves with His whole figure erect above them. But when man once comes into harmonious reciprocal action with an excited element, his movement in it becomes rhythmical. And so a jubilant feeling must have unfolded itself in Christ's heart on the exulting waters; and with this feeling those hidden powers of life must have been disengaged and become active, which also are said to appear in the life of the magnetically excited, so that such persons cannot sink in

water, but are borne up by it.¹ But Christ's walking on the water, in the co-working of this perfect consciousness of God and His imperturbable repose—of this elevation of soul in the feeling of harmony with the agitated element—and of this rhythmically borne and noblest corporeity,—exhibits the unity of the new human life in the spirit as it attains dominion over nature. In this miracle the Man of the spirit, in His world-historical importance, is borne out of the water of nature-life. It is a symbolical fact which has gained a natural position in an extraordinary rich history of New Testament operations. The more man regains the full consciousness of the sovereignty of his spirit over nature, the more he regains power over the natural feelings of his life,—the more does the dread of nature vanish from his path, and he resumes the full dominion over its forces.

But this discrepancy with nature into which man has fallen by his guilt is further manifest in distinct evils with which man is afflicted, particularly in his infirmities and sicknesses. These evils are characteristic marks of the deep corruption of the old æon; they are united most intimately with sin. It would indeed be hyper-Jewish if we were disposed to lay as a burden on the individual, his peculiar infirmity as his desert. Such a view can be regarded only as a popular superstition. It is an insult to the spirit of the Hebrew religion to charge it with maintaining it. And if any one would ascribe it to Christ, it would be in opposition to His most explicit declarations.² Yet, on the other hand, we must also mark it as hyper-heathenish, if the general connection of all sin with all evil, and the general appointment of all evils to be the punishment of all sins, and if, lastly, the spectacle that a thousand times individuals pay for their individual transgressions, should be denied. Only materialism in morals can wish to dissever the bond of connection between sin and punitive evil. Now, among the people of

¹ ‘As often as they wished to bring her (the seeress of Prevorst) in magnetic circumstances to a bath, a most wonderful phenomenon appeared,—all her limbs, with her chest and abdomen, were seized with a peculiar jerking motion, with perfect elasticity, which always raised her out of the water.’—Extract from the ‘*Scherin von Prevorst*.’ See Tholuck’s *Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte*, p. 100.

² Strauss (ii. 75) finds, first of all, in the expressions of Jesus (Matt. ix. 1) a reference to the ‘Jewish’ view, that evil, and especially the sickness of the individual, is the punishment of his sin. His subsequent remark is at variance with this, that Jesus expressly declared of the case proposed to Him (John ix. 1, &c.), that ‘this special evil was not owing to the criminality of the individual, but was founded on higher divine signs.’ Thus the ‘higher educated’ author of the fourth Gospel seems to have allowed Jesus to reject the former view; yet, on the other hand, according to John v. 14, ‘infirmity as a punishment of sin’ is announced to the man cured at the pool of Bethesda. But this must relate to ‘sinning generally,’ so that the meaning of Jesus was, that if that man only sinned again generally, he would again be afflicted with disease. The passage in Luke xiii. 1 ought to confirm the view of the connection between sin and misfortune in every individual (whence it would follow, that the eighteen men on whom the tower of Siloam fell, according to the Lord’s views, were all equally guilty). Along with this ‘vulgar Hebrew’ view of sickness and evil, Jesus must have been burdened with the opposite Essene-ebionitish ‘view,’ according to which the righteous in this æon are the suffering, the poor, and the sick. Such are the contradictions which are here cast as reflections on the clear mirror of the ethical consciousness of Jesus.

Israel the feeling of this connection was developed in a very high degree, and partially to a morbid excess. They had experienced God's chastisements under the discipline of the law, and often had bowed under His strokes with slavish dread. The miserable mental state of the unfortunate was aggravated by the harshness with which they were condemned by their more fortunate pharisaically-minded brethren. And at the time of Christ's advent almost all the fruits on the tree of human misery in Israel appeared to be ripened. The chronic diseases which are indigenous in Palestine, and countries of a similar climate, such as blindness, leprosy, paralysis, and nervous disorders, were very widely spread. Christ found Himself in the fulness of the Spirit placed in the presence of this misery. He met with many sufferers, who were at once in need of salvation and of bodily healing. By means of the latter, the sense of the former was ripened; and, in their desire for salvation, the state of mind was produced which fitted them for receiving bodily relief, that is, faith in the possibility of miraculous aid. In the fulness of the Spirit and of the peace of God lay the power of Christ to forgive the sins of those who felt their need of salvation, and, by the assurance of the grace of God, to animate their hearts with the glow of a new life. With an impulse of that positive confidence in God which He possessed, He could transport, by His consolations, to a heaven of divine joy those souls that felt themselves cast down to the gates of hell. How could Christ have cherished in His spirit this power to forgive sins in an abstract form; that is, only a power over the spirits of men, and not at the same time a power over their souls and bodily organisms? It was in accordance with His concrete victorious power over evil, that when it met Him in individual cases, He steadily regarded it from the root to the summit. But so also would the diseased, who, under Israelitish discipline, were trained to exercise faith in His aid, expect from Him, according to their entire view of the world, concrete aid, both spiritual and bodily.¹ According to the prophetic promises, the Israelite expected in his Messiah a Saviour who would work miracles; therefore the Jew who was anxious for salvation could not have received and retained so firmly the consolation of the forgiveness of sins from the lips of Jesus, if it had not been confirmed to him by bodily aid. It is difficult for the penitent sinner to retain absolution in pure spirituality. The Christian finds the seal of his reconciliation in the renewed peace of his society (*Sozietät*), especially in the sacrament, by which he becomes one with the Church and with the Lord of the Church. The temporary sacrament with which the contrite Israelite received his absolution from the lips of Jesus, was the miracle. Although this connection between the outward and

¹ [So Ewald, while he maintains that Jesus satisfied all the deepest, godliest longing in Israel, says (p. 219 of his *Geschichte Christus*), 'The kingdom of the perfect, true religion must break the power and the destructive consequences of sin; but all human ills are so connected with sin, that even those which are bodily only through it become thoroughly dangerous and radically obstinate, and therefore even those are the proper objects of the deeds of might of the genuine King.'—ED.]

inward healing was not in all cases equally apparent and marked, yet even in those wherein it was faintest it existed in some measure, so that those who needed bodily aid did homage to the Lord as the Messiah; and Weisse has justly remarked, that faith in the forgiveness of sins, and the effect of it, is to be regarded as a prominent feature of the cures performed by Christ.

The case of the paralytic at Capernaum (Matt. ix. 1) appears to us the most striking example of this agency of Christ. First of all, he received from Christ the assurance of the forgiveness of his sins. But the pharisaical spirits wished to despoil him of this inestimable gift by pronouncing the absolution to be blasphemy; upon which our Lord ratified it with a heavenly sacrament which they could not gainsay, by saying to the sick man, ‘ Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house ! ’

The words of Jesus, therefore, penetrated as a ray of vital power the hearts of those who believed in His miracles, operating with creative energy, and imparting a healthy vitality to every part of the frame. There is a class of diseases which may be regarded as an exhaustion of the fulness and freshness of the organism, namely, hereditary bodily infirmities. Now it lies in the nature of the case, that such infirmities must soonest give way to Christ’s vital ray which penetrates the life-root of the infirm through their organism. The cure of a man born blind may appear more difficult within the range of common experience than the cure of one who has become blind, but in relation to the conception of miracle it may be considered as the easier. The sun with its fresh rays can most easily stimulate the stunted growth of a plant. The solar ray, which somehow was wanting to the bodily stunted in the very beginnings of their life, now darts suddenly into the root of their life, and completes their first birth with the beginning of the second. Also the lame and deformed appear to stand in a nearer relation to the psychico-electrical powerful agency, to the lightning flash of the miraculous word of Jesus.¹

Fevers form another kind of suffering.² Their cure shows how positive repose and heavenly tranquillity can be communicated with healing power to the sick; or how the fiery conflict of fever against evil can be instantaneously rendered victorious by the warm stream of life which proceeds from Christ.

The healing of lepers belongs to the most important³ cures effected by Jesus. The leprosy seemed to seize inexorably on the whole living substance of the sufferer, and to have doomed him to death. But this fearful disease, which in general was so fatal, was sometimes capricious. It would strike out on the surface of the

¹ Cures of the blind are mentioned or narrated in Matt. ix. 27, xii. 22, xv. 30, xx. 30, xxi. 14;—of the paralytic, to whom as a particular class the lame and the maimed belong, Matt. iv. 24, viii. 6, ix. 2, xi. 5, xii. 16, xv. 30; Luke vi. 6, xiii. 11; John v. 1;—the healing of the woman with the issue of blood, Matt. ix. 20;—the cure of a man with the dropsy is narrated Luke xiv. 2. Many cures are repeated in the parallel passages.

² See Matt. viii. 14; John iv. 52.

³ Matt. viii. 2; Luke xvii. 12.

body, and pass off in a white eruption on the skin. This natural process of cure corresponded entirely to Christ's method of cure; His healing operations proceeded from within outwards.

The demoniacs of the New Testament history are, on the one hand, classed by the Evangelists with the other sick; but on the other hand, they are distinguished as a peculiar class from the common sick. That first of all they were considered and treated as sick persons, is evident. They appear as such, according to the symptoms of their malady as nervous, epileptic, insane, raving, and the like. Matthew speaks of the sick who were affected with various distempers and plagues, and then divides these into three classes: 'those possessed with devils, and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy' (Matt. iv. 24). But they are distinguished again from the common sick. Mark says, 'Jesus healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils' (i. 34). By these distinctions with which, on the one hand, the Evangelists represent the demoniacs as sick, but on the other, as afflicted by a demon, their conception of the mysterious phenomenon goes beyond the opposition between the supernaturalist and the rationalist views. According to the first, it is asserted, these sufferers were possessed by demons, therefore they were not naturally sick. Then on the other side it is said, they were naturally sick, therefore not possessed by demons. The arguing on both sides may be thus represented: One party maintains, the wind blows into the chamber, therefore the window is not open; the other asserts, on the contrary, the window stands open, therefore the wind does not blow into the chamber.

Here we must revert to the doctrine we have stated above, of the infinitely delicate operation of ethical powers. As it is applicable to the doctrine of angels and of devils, so also to that of demons. The popular view of the material, plastic lodgment of one demon or more in the body of a possessed person is sensuously coarse; but hardly so much so as the opposite supposition, that a man is afflicted with a natural nervous disorder, and on that account does not lie under demoniacal influences. There are hereditary nervous disorders, mysterious obstructions of the psychical life; strange dissonances and disturbances enter into the course of life which have this common quality, that they more or less affect the freedom of man's ethical life. If he could be healthy in this want of freedom, he would go back to the pure instinct of animal life. But such a normal human-animal life would be, in its very naturalness, a frightful monstrosity. Sure enough, man without freedom must become in his untuned, irritable nerve-life, more or less a football of ethical influences, as necessarily as an Æolian harp placed in a current of air must receive and return every wandering gust of wind. But the irritability of such a morbid nerve-life, according to the nature of this life, must be simply boundless. Fortunately, under the category of those who were afflicted with divers diseases, the lunatics are found between the possessed and the paralytic. The nature of

this complaint may give us the key for the solution of the whole problem respecting the demoniacs. The lunatic is so excitable in his nerve-life, that even the influence of the returning moon irritates him and aggravates his malady. He is, in short, possessed by the moon, inasmuch as he is possessed by its influence. We will not here inquire what power the spirit of the earth (*Erdgeist*) exerts over the healthy man in his sleep, but so much is a fact of very ancient experience, that the moon exerts an irritating influence on a certain class of nervous sufferers. With this remark the whole question is in fact already decided. If the moon can exert so strong an influence on these morbidly excitable chords, which in the normal man are designed to return the pure impression of all heaven, we must much more expect that they will be exposed to the strongest influences and invasions of psychical moods, powers, and intentions. The sick youth whom the Lord cured at the foot of the Mount of Transfiguration was at once epileptic, demoniac, and lunatic ; therefore, a person disordered in his nerves, disturbed by the influence of the moon as well as by that of demons.

Yet it is a consideration of great weight, that the excitability of these nervous patients was a consequence of a deeply seated discordance, and therefore was a morbid, gloomy excitability. Hence an elective affinity was formed between this susceptibility and the impure influences of impure spirits. The prophets, as the elect of God, were in the highest degree susceptible for the revelations of the world of light ; the demoniacs, on the other hand, presented an inverted prophetic order, which attained its disastrous maturity in the days of the deepest degeneracy of the Jewish nation, when their psychical susceptibility for evil influences was complete. And, accordingly, they were pervaded and domineered over by unclean spirits, by the psychically powerful influences of an evil nature—by demons ; but, according to their declaration and the popular notion, they were possessed by them. This condition, therefore, has three factors, which must be estimated conjointly : first of all, the natural substratum of possession, the morbid state of the nerves ; then the aggregate power of the influences to which the patient is subjected ; lastly, and thirdly, his notion of his own sufferings, which was closely connected with the general popular notion of such sufferings. That natural foundation of possession, the morbid state of the nerves in demoniacs, has many forms and stages. We find, for example, one demoniac like a seer proclaiming the Messiah, while another is unable to utter a word. Sometimes this disorder appears as a stupid frenzy, impelling to self-destruction ; the demoniac throws himself now into the fire, now into the water : at another time it is a spectral illusion ; the demoniac is so excited that he believes himself identified with a legion of evil spirits. But as the irritability was constituted, the influences corresponded to it. The Gadarene might, therefore, be really forced in his irritability to exhibit a thousandfold different operations of evil. These influences, according to their nature, might proceed from spirits of all kinds, as far

as they could exercise an overwhelming influence on his psychical life by a powerful psychical influence, by violent approximation, by vigorous attack, by a peculiar affinity between their power and the susceptibility of the sufferer. The demoniac influences might therefore proceed from devilish spirits, from deceased men, or even from living, powerful, and sinister characters; for in this case everything depends on the power and nature of the influences. Further, they might differ in their degree: disturbances, superficial, transitory and constant, weak and strong, distant and near, or in absolute contact. If there are fallen devilish spirits, as we have found to be natural, we are led to expect that the lower class among them busy themselves in producing disturbed phenomena in the region of human misery. If, moreover, earthly and worldly-minded deceased persons strive to return to a life on earth, it is by no means inconceivable that they should seek to put themselves again in connection with the world they have lost through the organisms of those who are not free. The Jews generally recoiled with horror from Sheol. This aversion to the kingdom of the dead was especially rife in the time of Christ, when the chiliast extravagance was at its height. The degeneracy of the times might show itself also in this particularly, that the boundary line between this side the grave and the other had vanished in a most fearful manner, since the living were in part fallen to the kingdom of the shades, while the demons swarmed in unsatisfied craving for life about the hearths of the living, so that a kind of marsh-land was formed between this world and the next, in which the deformed of both regions mingled together. The demons, indeed, in their influence on the sufferers, could traverse from the most remote distance to the closest proximity. But it is difficult to determine to what degree the oppression of the sufferers by the demons might rise. Yet we cannot get rid of all spirits from the other world, without losing the notion of possession. And characters of an evil tendency belonging to this world might operate injuriously on the life of men psychically diseased. But these evils were carried to their height by the popular superstition. The doctrine of possession was completed in the popular dread. The consequence was, that those who personally experienced demoniacal influences soon surrendered themselves with dismay to their power, and then exhibited it plastically with all the energy of a spectre-haunted soul. If insanity is contemplated in its simplest form, it shows here the characteristic that the insane person makes his fixed idea the demon of his consciousness, and speaks out, not from his rational consciousness, but from this demoniacal one. There is no difficulty, therefore, in conceiving that demoniacs in general speak from the consciousness of the spirits that torment them. But from such a phenomenon, it by no means follows that the foreign spirit in them has lodged itself between their own consciousness and their body, and thus as a stranger speaks out of a strange house. Rather, we only see that the demoniac has slavishly surrendered himself to the influence that torments him. As the

prophet, in the most elevated, luminous, and free ecstasy, announces the word of the Lord, without distinguishing it from his own—probably not because his own consciousness has vanished, but because it is identical with the Spirit of the Lord, and acts in subserviency to it—so also is it with the demoniac, in his enslaved and gloomy ecstasy. He himself speaks, though he has made over his *Ego* and his consciousness to the spirits who rule him. His consciousness has identified itself with the demoniacal influence which he has imbibed from them, and exhibits it plastically and imitatively in a constrained visionary mood. Only from this state of things can the dark but powerful feeling of deranged life be explained, as is shown by the violent excitement of the demoniacs in the presence of Christ. If the consciousness of a demon itself had been fully active in the organism of the demoniac of which it had taken possession, such symptoms could not have been exhibited ; and as little could they have been shown if the patient had not really had the feeling, as if a strange spirit stood before the Lord.

It is very evident from the nature of this condition, that it must be distinguished altogether from those cases in which a man gives himself up to evil in conscious and specific acts of his own inner life. The Gospel history marks the distinction in the most decisive manner, since, as we have seen, it treats the demoniacs as sick persons, and even as irresponsible, which is plainly shown, among many other things, by the representation of their irregularities as acts which the demons performed with them. The early Church also made a marked distinction between reckless sinners and possessed persons : the former they excommunicated, for the latter they employed exorcisms. The mingling of these ethical characters, as it appears in the most offensive excess, when exorcism was connected with baptism, and as it still often occurs in theological treatises on the condition of demoniacs, serves most decidedly to obscure our discernment of the ethical deterioration of man into the devilish as well as of demoniacal possession. Olshausen has felt the existence of the distinction, but has not clearly carried it out (*Comment.* i. 269, ed. Clark). ‘The condition of demoniacs must always presuppose a certain degree of moral culpability ; yet so that the sin committed by them does not take the form of absolute wickedness (that is, a voluntary consent to the infused evil thoughts), but appears more as predominant sensuality (especially unchastity), which was always indulged with a resistance of the better self.’ Nothing can be made of these distinctions. Of the practical offences of the demoniacs we know nothing, and are not in the least justified in charging, for example, the daughter of the Canaanitish woman with sins of that class. Although it cannot be denied that the condition of demoniacs might originate in individuals from personal offences, from irregularities which opened the door for the demon into the psychical life ; yet these sick persons, taken at an average, form a poor little group, which in part even from childhood found themselves under a psychical ban. And so it was with the demons

by whom they were tormented. They were regarded by the Jews as inferior devils, or impure spirits that had been forfeited to Beelzebub, since they cherished the notion that they might be expelled by the help of Beelzebub. The most different states and characters are also confounded, when the spheres of demoniacal suffering and of demoniacal acting are not kept distinct. But in order to hold fast this distinction, we must take care to observe that many symbolical expressions are found in the Gospel history, which are borrowed from the sphere of demoniacal suffering, to designate purely ethical relations. To this class apparently belongs the language which John uses of Judas, after he had received the sop from Jesus at the Passover, that '*Satan entered into him*' (John xiii. 27). We might also be disposed to adduce here the account given of Mary Magdalene, that the Lord cast seven devils out of her (Mark xvi. 9), since it is not probable that we are to reckon literally seven distinct demoniacal possessions or psychical enthrallments, and from such a reckoning draw a precise and definite conclusion. Add to this, the number seven denotes in a significant manner, not only the extreme generally, but also the extreme of self-activity.¹ The seven unclean spirits remind us, by contrast, of the seven spirits of God. And as these spirits denote the one Holy Spirit in His fulness and agency, so the seven devils may denote the impure spirit of the world in its collective power and activity. And as Christ, by having the consecration of the seven spirits, is distinguished as moving freely in the life of the Holy Spirit, so the possession of seven demons might distinguish the ethically culpable, and therefore metaphorical, possession of an erring soul that was completely under the power of the spirit of the world. According to the Evangelist Luke (viii. 2), the Lord was accompanied in His journeys by 'certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils (*δαιμόνια ἐπτά*), and Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered to Him of their substance.' If into such a group of females, containing one, or several, whom Jesus had freed from demoniacal suffering, a convert entered whom Jesus had rescued from the heavy curse of sin, it is very probable that, in accordance with the prevalent Jewish notions, she would express her gratitude by saying that He had cast seven devils out of her.² This explanation is confirmed by Christ's parabolic discourse, in which He represents to the Jews the condition in which they were as most perilous, by the phenomena of demoniacal suffering (Matt. xii. 43, compared with Luke xi. 24). 'When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest and finding none. Then he saith, I will return into my house

¹ Compare Matt. xviii. 21.

² Hence tradition has more weighty reason for regarding this Mary as the great sinner (Luke vii. 36-50), than the circumstance that the woman who anointed the Lord at Bethany is also called Mary. According to Winer, the designation of 'the woman who was a sinner' as Mary Magdalene arose from confounding the history in Luke vii. 36 with John xii. 1.

from whence I came out ; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there ; and the last state of that man is worse than the first. Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation.'

This discourse, if we look at the connection, seems to be neither wholly figurative, nor wholly literal. Jesus had just before cast out a demon from a sick man (Matt. xii. 22). But when the Pharisees reproached Him as casting out devils by Beelzebub, that demon seemed to come back with seven others and insolently to confront Him, as if in mockery of His former victory. Jesus found in this an image of His whole ministry in Israel. Everywhere He expelled the single demon of psychical suffering from among the people ; but everywhere it returned again with the seven demons of blaspheming unbelief.¹ The demon appears here with the number seven, and therefore as the demon of free conscious culpability, of the vilest depravity. It is highly significant, and quite in accordance with the Gospel history, to represent those direful demoniacal sufferings as sevenfold less than the wretchedness of demoniacal criminality.

From this metaphorical mode of speaking, with which Christ treated of demoniacal relations, it does not follow that He adopted by way of accommodation the general opinions of His time respecting the true demoniacal nature of the sufferings of the possessed. That He shared in these opinions, His whole treatment and estimate of these phenomena testifies, which always remained the same in the private conversations He held with His disciples respecting them (Matt. xvii. 21). Strauss therefore is quite justified in ascribing these opinions to the Lord (ii. 7). But from this we are not justified in affirming, that Jesus shared in the sensuous representations of the people respecting the corporeal nature of these demoniacal possessions, as the same writer also maintains. The very connection of the phenomena of demoniac suffering with those of demoniac action, as the Lord understood it, proves that in the possessions He had recognized the psychical element, the relation between suffering and ethical self-activity. We may draw, however, the same conclusion in a special manner from His mode of healing.

As far as we can trace and judge of the moral state in the obscure circumstances of the possessed, the chief feature that strikes us is the moral despondency, the abject flinching and trembling before the assailing hostile power, whether this arose from the demoniac fixed ideas of the sufferers, or from individual demoniacal influences.

¹ That the Lord, by the words (Luke xi. 23), 'He that is not with Me is against Me,' &c., designed to point out the cures of the common Jewish exorcists as merely apparent, which rather injured than promoted the kingdom of God, as Neander thinks, is not supported by the connection. For Christ had no conflict with the exorcists, but with the blasphemers who stood before Him. These came against Him as His enemies, as sevenfold possessed, who wished to annihilate His work. The Lord also could not well dispute the genuineness of the cures performed by the Jewish exorcists, as far as they were viewed in their psychical limitation, at the very instant, when He appealed to them.

This abject bearing cannot avoid showing itself in some way or other, so as to afford a glimpse of the moral state of the soul, even in cases where the demoniac is born in the soul-slavery of a disordered state of the nerves. At all events, it appears as the first step in healing the demoniacs, that Jesus crushed at a blow this despondency of the demonized consciousness. He crushed it, namely, by the manner in which He addressed the demon. He set spiritual power against spiritual power, the stronger against the weaker. With a lion's spring He made Himself master of His prey. With one divine, determined wrench, He released the captive soul from its thrall. But this, according to the nature of the case, could only take place by the impartation of His own power to it. His power was shed upon the sufferers when He threatened the demons by His crushing rebuke. The style in which Christ addressed men had always a tone of kingly decision ; it was the expression of heavenly power and certainty. By the forcible impression which these brief winged words of command uttered by the Lord made on the souls of men, they have fixed themselves in the Gospel tradition with unchangeable freshness. But it is obvious that Christ, in this method of throwing fire with His words into the soul, made a specific difference between the sorrowful and the despairing. The sorrowful He consoled with all the miraculous tone of a heavenly sympathy : the burdened sinner, for example, He consoled with the words, 'My son ! thy sins are forgiven thee !' the woman suffering from the issue of blood with, 'Be of good cheer, My daughter !' Mary Magdalene with the exclamation, 'Mary !' and others in different ways. And here it must be remarked, that the modern philanthropic but enervated treatment of souls has made a great mistake, in placing the despairing in the same category with the sorrowful, and attempting to revive them by consolations. They require a very different treatment : they must be roused to regain their self-possession by words of severity ; they need the influences and quickening utterances of glowing, impassioned power. The thunder and lightning of a saintly soul, which can rebuke them as with the flames of divine wrath, restores to them that power which feebler addresses could never give. Indeed, only the pure spirit of Christ can properly discharge this office of rebuke.¹ Christ was the Master also in this art of curing souls. Not only did He in this manner restore demoniacs, but all who either temporarily or constantly were unmanned by dejection. Thus He rebukes the disciples when they lost their self-command in the storm ; He rebuked the fever of Peter's wife's mother (Luke iv. 39) ; and exclaimed in the synagogue to the woman bowed down by a spirit of infirmity, 'Woman ! thou art loosed from thine infirmity' (Luke xiii. 12),—He dispersed immediately her despondency, the spirit of her weakness, by His word, and then, by laying His hands on her, healed her bodily infirmity. This last example leads us to consider the manner in which Jesus especially treated demoniacs. How glorious the royal

¹ [See Isaac Taylor's *Saturday Evening*, Essay xv., *The Power of Rebuke*.—TR.]

Prince of spirits appears among them with these master-words of rebuking love ! ‘ He cast out the spirits with a word,’ says Matthew (viii. 16). ‘ He straitly charged them,’ says Mark, ‘ that they should not make Him known’ (iii. 12). To the possessed in the synagogue at Capernaum He cried out, ‘ Hold thy peace and come out of him.’ Probably the command, ‘ Come out !’ was re-echoed in the soul, as the Lord in such cases injected it as a divine power into the consciousness of the sick man, and the first act of his reawakened freedom consisted precisely in this, that he repeated the word in his own soul, ‘ Come out !’ In this state of captivity the possessed was one with the demon, and spoke out of the consciousness of the demon ; therefore the Lord also addressed the demon that was in him. But in the moment of his release he became one with the Lord, and the word which the Lord thundered against the demon he himself addressed to him. If we rely on the exactness of the order of the particulars in the account of Mark (v. 7) and of Luke (viii. 29), the memorable case here occurred, that the demoniac was not at once healed after the Lord had spoken the decisive word. Christ had said to him, ‘ Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit !’ The demoniac consciousness in this man was now indeed shaken to its foundations ; but as he felt himself possessed by a legion of evil spirits, the demoniacal within him was not quite reached by the address in the singular. Christ saw at once how the cure was to be completed. He asked him for his name. ‘ What is thy name ?’ He answered, ‘ My name is Legion, for we are many.’ But from this insolent raving of his demoniac consciousness the contradiction already glanced forth : the prostration of spirit which had shown itself in the very circumstance of his running to meet the Lord. The demons now asked permission to go into a herd of swine, of which we shall speak hereafter. Matthew’s word, ‘ Go !’ seems to have been here the authentic and decisive word of the Lord, which echoed in the soul of the possessed, ‘ Go !’ The rebuke with which Christ met the crowd, who were waiting for Him at the foot of the Mount of Transfiguration, is very characteristic. Here was a spiritual battle to be won again, which His disciples had lost from a want of a more rigorous self-discipline in prayer and fasting. The spirit of despondency which had mastered the whole circle by the unexpected failure, was to be expelled. The Lord was sensible of this psychical obstruction, and removed it by a powerful rebuke. He then made a path for the communication of His miraculous power by strengthening the heart of the father of the unfortunate youth. Then followed the healing word of power. In the crisis of such a cure, the most violent change came over the sufferer in an instant. His consciousness sprang up, so to speak, from the abyss to the heights of heaven. It was natural for the cure to end in a final dreadful paroxysm. The sick man at Capernaum cried out aloud when the divine voice of deliverance pealed like thunder through his soul. In the instance before us, the sufferer became fearfully agitated and fell to the earth as dead ; a second miracle was needed,

which Christ performed when He took him by the hand and lifted him up.

It is scarcely necessary to call attention to the fact, that all these narratives of miraculous cures bear a decided impress of individuality and the noblest stamp of internal truth.

But in what degree these cures were complete, we see from the language of the restored Gadarene. When his countrymen desired Jesus to depart out of their coasts, he requested that he might be allowed to accompany Him. Though a legion of evil spirits had before haunted him, his consciousness was now firmly fixed in free devoted surrender to the one Spirit of light, whose power had rescued him and become master of his soul.

The whole category of the Lord's miraculous cures serves to exhibit the dominion of His Spirit over the flesh, since their effect was to re-establish the dominion of the human spirit over morbid corporeity, and its victory over the influences of the powers of evil. The liberation of human spirits, and their restoration to health by the blessing of the Spirit, as it goes on to the end of the world, and has its basis in the power of Christ's Spirit and in His victory, exhibited its first blossoms in the miraculous cures. But we now enter on a new circle of miracles. We see the first signs of the spiritual glory of Christ, which is to transform the earthly sphere of this lower world. To this class belong, as the clearest and most distinct signs, the great miracles which Christ performed on the mental states of men. As such, we consider most decidedly the miracle at Cana and those of feeding the multitudes. The key to these truly heavenly facts is wanting when the mental state of the guests of Jesus is left unnoticed, and as much attention is lavished on the elements as if we had merely to do with bread-baskets and wine-jars. When Jesus made provision for a circle of friends, or for thousands of His adherents, the question is of the highest importance, What influence He exerted on their souls? Now we know He was never disposed to gain adherents by violent or over-persuasive urgency. The Son makes those free whom His Spirit takes captive. He could only by slow degrees establish the heavenly kingdom of Christian dispositions, because He mingled His life with the life of the world through the medium of the holiest tenderness, or through the tenderest holiness. But a heavenly kingdom of states of feeling He could at once call forth, by virtue of that captivating spiritual power with which His personality operated on susceptible souls. Such souls, by the power of His divine Spirit which inspired them, and by the glow of sympathy which ravished them when once touched, He could raise for some moments to heaven, and transport into a common frame of divine joy, peace, and love, in which life appeared as new, and the world as transformed. Such fore-tastes of heaven make their appearance throughout the whole Gospel history. But the difference must be lost sight of between transient moods and permanent dispositions, between occasional flights of excited feeling and the constant soaring of the Spirit,

when it is thought strange that many of those whom Christ had borne upwards in a favourable hour should relapse into common or even evil tendencies,—that the majority, or even all, at times should fall away. And it would argue ignorance of the spirit of Christ, if we were to expect that He would not venture so boldly to call forth the flowers of the new life, because He knew that these flowers would for a long while have no fruits. But we find sufficient indications of the miraculous elevation of men's souls in events of this kind, and of the connection of these miraculous transactions with these miraculous states of mind. On the occasion of the marriage at Cana, for the first time in the history of the world a Christian assemblage for festive purpose took place in the presence of Christ. The mother of Jesus is full of great and anxious, and yet joyful forebodings ; she communicates her state of mind to the servants of the family, who are imbued with the greatest confidence in the words of Jesus. They fill the water-pots—they bring the beverage at His bidding with perfect readiness. Meanwhile the company are so occupied with their conviviality, that they know not what has transpired outside. But the wine they are now drinking at the height of the feast is pronounced, even by the governor of the feast, to be as good as, or better than, what had been drunk before. In the element of a singular state of mind, in which the wedding guests had become one as branches with the true vine, with Christ as the principle of the world's transformation, the water becomes changed for them into wine. We have here to do with the operations of a higher ethical ecstasy—with the operations of a very beautiful but extraordinary state of mind, in which the festive Jews find themselves transported, by the power of Christ's Spirit, from the beginnings of the world to the heights of the transformed world. The drink which they quaff in this state of mind, being blessed to them by the presence of Christ, is to their taste the choicest wine. Thus they enjoy it not in mere spiritualistic fancy, but with the most real gust.¹ But how it was with the supply of wine outside of the highly

¹ We can represent to ourselves Christ's agency which changed water into wine in successive stages. From the history of Somnambulism, it is known that in the high degrees of the magnetic *rapport*, all the sensations and tastes of the magnetizer are repeated in the person who is psychically affected by him. Now at Cana there was no circle of magnetized persons assembled round the Lord, but a circle of souls whom His presence had raised to ecstasy in their festivity. What therefore in the department of magnetism may appear as a fact, might here recur with intensified power, and in a more vitalized form (as, for example, the constrained morbid clairvoyance of the somnambulist in the free healthy clairvoyance of the prophet). When therefore Christ calls forth in Himself the intuition (*Anschauung*) of wine with fresh creative power, when Christ drinks good wine, the others drink it also by means of the psychical connection. But the company that surrounds the Lord is not a mere circle of passive, receptive beings. His companions are by faith brought into active harmony with Him. As the branches do not merely receive the sap which the vine conveys to them, but form the wine out of it and with it, so these festive guests, at the moment of their union with the Lord, infused all their plastic life-power in order to complete the change. This is the first stage of the immediate operation of Christ. But the second goes into the elements of the beverage which they enjoy. And here we would call to mind the taste of magnetized water, only to indicate again how, in a higher life-circle, the same phenomenon may be repeated in a higher key. 'The

vitalized sphere of the feast, would be a question of the same kind as what transformation (*Verklärung*) remained in the consecrated bread outside the holy sphere of the actual celebration of the Supper. Also the miracle of feeding a multitude, which, without prejudging, we here consider as having occurred twice, was evidently effected by a state of mind allied to His own in the guests of Jesus. The confidence with which He announced that He was about to feed the thousands, and even the thought of this feeding, was so new a revelation of the kingdom of love and confidence, that the souls of those who had once followed Him as His adherents into the wilderness, were elevated by this event far above their ordinary state of feeling. They sat down at His word, and their doing so indicated an exceedingly high and powerful elevation of their feelings. But it is an acknowledged fact, that impassioned expectation and joy can be propagated electrically and with augmented force among thousands. After the first miracle of feeding, those who had partaken of the food wished to make the Lord king,—a proof that they had celebrated a feast in the highest pitch of theocratic enthusiasm. In those moments the heavenly power of Christ could feed its thousands miraculously. His word alone had already strengthened them afresh, to say nothing of the word in connection with the natural means. Thus the feeding so as to satisfy them is explained,—but not the overplus, the baskets-full of fragments. On this point it makes a great difference, whether we are inclined to see an Old Testament feast of loving omnipotence, or a New Testament one of omnipotent love. This remark requires further explanation. That among the guests of Jesus many were destitute of food, is certain, and the whole multitude were in danger of suffering the pains of hunger. But it appears incredible, if we take into account the Jewish method of travelling and making pilgrimages, that many of these pilgrims should not have carried with them a supply of provisions, greater or less. On these supplies, indeed, the Lord would not wish first of all to reckon. The miracle of feeding and of satisfying which He undertook, was quite independent of such supplies. But it could as little on that account be His concern to fill a multitude of baskets with fragments, over and above what was eaten. Now if such provisions are presupposed, we may be inclined to take the following view of the transaction. Christ feeds the thousands exclusively with the substance of His own bread. But those among these thousands who really had provisions, would hold them absolutely in reserve for themselves. Their hearts therefore remained closed, their private property remained like a fixture by their side; while Christ gives up everything, and the poor among them take their share of the distributed bread. Even in collecting the fragments, their gifts in

taste of magnetized water,' says Fr. Fischer (*Der Sonambulismus*, p. 235), 'is said to be exceedingly various; sometimes bitter, sometimes sweetish, sometime sourish like Seltzer water, sometimes strong and vinous, sometimes burning, sometimes tart like sulphur and ink, sometimes saltish. But it shows a certain constancy in one and the same magnetizer.'

bread do not add to the amount. Evidently, on such a supposition, the power of Christ is glorified at the cost of the operation of His love; and the dark miracle of the unheard-of, selfish reserve of the multitude hanging on the lips of Jesus, confronts the direct, exalted miracle of benevolent omnipotence. But if we are desirous of commemorating the founding of a New Testament feast, a heavenly bloom of social life, in the miraculous feeding, we must above all things feel how the hearts of the guests of Jesus thawed under His festive invitation and thanksgiving—how they were rendered great, warm, free, and brotherly, so that no one would keep his bread for himself, while he enjoyed likewise that of his brother. Thus we gain two splendid miracles of omnipotent love, which in the warmth of the moment form one—Christ feeds thousands with His little stock by an operation of heavenly power.¹ But this feeding, as an operation of love, opens their hearts, and forms a pre-celebration of the final transformation of the world in the blessedness of Christian brotherly love—a pre-celebration of the Christian voluntary community of goods; and thus the second miracle takes place, the miracle of superabundance among the thousands of the poor people in the wilderness.

It has been justly observed, that in these miracles we may descry a foreshadowing of the Holy Supper. Certainly the guests of Jesus were communicants as to the state of their feelings, though not in developed and ripened Christian insight. In the communion, wine is always poured out for those who partake of it, which has the power and significance of His blood, and bread is broken, which is received and experienced as the life and action of His body. But in the consecrated circle of the communion a thousand mysterious experiences occur, experiences of strengthening and refreshment, and even of exaltation to heaven, which are intimately allied to those miracles of the Lord which affected men's states of mind, and allied not merely in reference to their special origin, the living power of Christ's heart, but also in reference to their final aim, the transformation of the world. Those miracles, as well as the permanent blessings of Christ in the Holy Supper, may be regarded as fore-shadowings of the coming transformation of the world.

Attempts have been made to throw suspicions on the miracle at Cana by designating it 'a miracle of luxury.' Criticism resolves to do anything for the sake of gaining its object, even to put on pietist airs. But the spirit of Christ is perfectly self-consistent when it treats the higher modes of want—as, for example, the worrying per-

¹ It will be evident that the explanation of the miracle here given, refers to the natural explanation which Dr Paulus has given (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 162). But those who rightly apprehend our explanation, cannot fail to perceive the difference between it and the natural explanation. We regard the miracle of feeding and satisfying in its whole integrity as an operation of the power of Christ, which converts the existing means of feeding into the medium of a divine living power. In that case, the secondary miracle of the overplus is kept in view, and explained as above. We shall notice in the sequel the expressions in the Gospels which, according to Strauss (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 197), militate against this view.

plexity of a new-married couple, whose wedding is likely to end in ridicule and vexation for lack of wine—with the same sympathy as the lower modes. The anointing which Mary performed at Bethany in honour of the Lord, of whose departure she had a presentiment, also appeared a work of luxury ; but the Lord protected His female disciple against the attacks of those disciples who thought that the cost of the ointment should rather be given to the poor. Christianity will never allow itself to be changed into a mere hospital or alms-house, but in its spirit and aim always tends to the pure luxury of freeing and transforming the life, apart from the beautiful festive ideal manifestation of the spirit. A sickly spiritualism can accommodate itself only to the coarse natural constitution of the present phenomenal world ; the entire new world, on the other hand, which is to bloom forth from the living power of Christianity, and more especially the resurrection of the dead, appears to it as an extravagant luxury of Christian hope. But the Christian spirit cannot despair of the eternal unity between the idea and the life, and therefore expects that all Christian principles will one day celebrate their appearance in the reality, in the full splendour of the idea ; and it desries the foreshadowings of this future transformation in the ‘miracles of luxury,’ as they meet it, not merely in the marriage feast at Cana, or in the miraculous feeding of the multitude, but also in that quelling of the storm which Jesus effected, and in the miraculous draught of fishes which He caused.

In the history of the kingdom of God there is one class of miracles which may be called *miracles of theocratic parallelism*,—those, namely, in which the inner relation between the life of the earth and the life of humanity is exhibited in the most striking manner. Those persons who have not perceived, or who deny, this parallelism in the development of the corporeal and spiritual side of the current æon, and the coincidence of the great phases of development both inward and outward, should not venture to say anything about the supremacy of the idea, and about the ideality of the world. The Theocracy corrects their dualism. The majority of the miracles in the Old Testament history belong to this class of parallel miracles. A great phase in the history of the earth or the universe coincides with a great phase in the history of the kingdom of God ; and indeed the former is subservient to the latter, just as reasonably as the earth is subservient to man, or as the history of the universe is subservient to the history of spiritual life. Thus, for example, the plagues of Egypt coincide with the event of the redemption of Israel from Egyptian bondage ; and the moment in which Israel, pursued by Pharaoh, reached the shores of the Red Sea, was the same in which a singular natural phenomenon dried the bed of the sea. The theocratic spirit justly explains the coincidence of these events as proceeding from God’s ordination ; it marks it in true dignity of spirit as an operation, a fruit and consequence of its faith. But like the prophetic spirit, before the moment of the miracle arrived in which ‘the stars in their courses fought’ for Israel, it had an inspired

presentiment of it, and therefore announced it beforehand. It need not in the least perplex us when those miracles of parallelism come forward in giant forms. Nature always confronts man as a giant power, and yet bends before his spirit and becomes subservient to him with all her powers. It is a tacit, eternal miracle, that man, this naked, defenceless creature, bound to the earth, shivering in the blast, trembling in the water, dissolving in the heat, standing defenceless amidst a thousand armed warlike hosts of the brute creation,—this child that ‘plays on the hole of the asp, and puts his hand on the cockatrice’s den’ (*Isa. xi. 8*),—this Daniel in the lions’ den,—that he in the power of the spirit gains even a more decided ascendancy over nature, even releases it from its own captivity, since he brings its essence to light, and compels its action into the service of the spirit. This silent miracle has its great festive hours—world-historical Sundays—on which the giant spirit of Nature comes in a critical moment to the aid of the embarrassed divine man as an elephant to its master’s child,—when the course of Nature unfolds the consecrated, holy tendency of its movements, its silent concurrence with the course of the kingdom of God, in clear, grand signs. It is the triumph of Revelation that it has explained these signs, and with their explanation has declared the unity of the course of the world in its successive æons in the life of Nature and of man. These parallel miracles also reappear more strikingly in the history of the apostles ; the young Church needed the service of the giantess, Nature, who recognized in the former the beginning and pledge of her own glorification. In the history of the life of Jesus the parallel miracles are less conspicuous, because in Him perfected life was manifested, and therefore the glorification of Nature by the Spirit ; the elevation of the parallelism between the life of Nature and the life of the Spirit into a living unity. Besides the wonderful events at the death and resurrection of Jesus, which we shall notice in the sequel, we may regard the stilling of the storm on the Sea of Galilee as a miracle in which that parallelism appears and finds its solution. We cannot estimate too highly the world-historical importance of that hour, when the whole New Testament Church in its embryo life, the entire living power and spiritual quintessence of the Old Testament theocracy, after being rescued from a thousand perils by great miracles—in which therefore the hopes of humanity were enclosed in a paltry fishing-boat on the Galilean sea—were in the greatest danger of being swallowed up by the waves. Here also nature seems to have presented her dark side—she seemed to rave like a demon savage, and to aim at swallowing up the noblest life—life absolute. But Christ did not take the storm on this side : the awful agitation alarmed Him not ; it rocked Him to sleep. And when the alarm awoke Him, He found it necessary, first of all, to rebuke the storm in the hearts of His disciples.¹ Storm against storm : He rebuked

¹ The Evangelist Matthew seems to us to have reported the event in the correct succession of its several parts, since he places the rebuking of the disciples before the stilling of the storm. Mark and Luke adopt the reverse order.

them till they were ashamed ; deeply calmed in spirit, they looked on the storm with new eyes. With this alteration in the state of their minds, the storm must at once have seemed to them greatly to abate its fury. Then He rebuked the wind and the sea. But the wind and the waves are not hostile spiritual powers in His presence ; so that what He uttered was not so much an address as a prophetic annunciation, and a mysterious symbolic act. The proximate cause of the stilling of the wind and waves lay in the atmosphere ; and so far was the miracle a parallel one, and the rebuking word of Jesus prophetic. But the ultimate cause of the extraordinary hushing of the elements lay in the life and feelings of the God-man. To Him it was certain that the apparently monstrous independence thus confronting the human spirit exhibited only an apparent outbreak, in which the actual outbreak of man was reflected and punished ; that therefore this independence of Nature must be abolished in His spirit-life, and must be abolished for the world. This abolition He carried into effect by a symbolical act, the essence of which is a mystery of His deepest life. From the depths of His divine consciousness, of His eternity, He caused the fact to come forth in a miracle, that the spirit of solemn repose in His life put an end to the morbid agitations of Nature. He represented in a symbolical act this quiet operation of the Christian life of humanity, the ripe product of which is to be unfolded in the sabbatical peace of the new world.¹ The miraculous draughts of fish which the disciples made twice by the direction of the Lord (Luke v. 11 and John xxi. 1-11), pre-suppose in them neither an omniscience on the part of Christ, nor a universal sciolism (*allwisserei*) disturbing the divine unity of His life. The means of putting into exercise the extraordinary knowledge which He displayed on these occasions, lay in the hearts of the men who were attached to Him. Would He not notice from a distance the deep, bitter dejection which darkened their souls on account of the total failure of their night's toil ? Nothing in the world could more deeply interest Him than the state of those souls in which He was desirous of implanting His own heavenly life. But when, full of sympathy, He saw (as it were) through their eyes, and sought after the fish, he was certainly a sagacious fisherman who could detect the traces of the fishes in the play of shadows on the watery mirror, or by similar signs, if we are not disposed to admit that He became aware of their existence by the electrical action of an immense living shoal crowded together. A modern poet expresses the thought, that if man ever corresponded to his idea, the birds of heaven would fly

¹ Strauss finds in the scene of Jesus sleeping in the storm so remarkable a picture, that he thinks, 'If it be so, that what in one instance perhaps really happened, in nine instances must be formed from legends, we must be prepared more rationally for the possibility, that we have here one of these nine instead of that one instance.' We should not venture nine to one in order to gain a mere 'possibility' of winning. And yet the game is a scanty one; the evangelical view can be played without imprudence ; a thousand to one may be hazarded for the conviction that here that which is full of meaning (*das Sinnvolle*) is not legendary but reality; for Christ is unique among millions.

to him in flocks. Did the poet fetch this thought from the Gospels, and only believe that he must change the fishes to birds? That fishes are less intelligent than birds, does not incapacitate them for experiencing influences which are beyond our calculation; rather, indeed, for that very reason they are taken more readily by the slightest impression, especially as their life has less of individuality. So there are, for example, kinds which are enticed and taken at night by the shining of a light. The myth of the effect of the harp of Arion on the dolphin points, at all events, to some actual fact,—to an extraordinary movement of fish which was occasioned by the magic of human influence. Yet we are not going to start the question, whether perhaps, in both the instances to which we refer, the fish had made an irregular movement towards the shore on which Christ was standing. At all events, the Lord was certain of His word when He staked His whole authority with these men on the one draught which they were to make; and the less clearly we can understand whence He obtained this certainty, the more sublime do the life-depths appear of the man, as He must be, the God-man, 'under whose feet (according to Ps. viii.) were placed the fishes of the sea.'

Among the facts recorded in the Gospels which especially harmonize with the transformation of the world by Christ, must be reckoned the capture of the fish which Peter had to make in order to satisfy the persons who demanded the temple-tax of Jesus and himself.¹ The account of this miracle has been considered the most perplexing in the whole Gospel history. Some have imagined that they have detected the narrator in a palpable contradiction, when they have asked how the fish could bite the hook with a stater in its mouth. Criticism, in raptures at this discovery, has bitten more daringly than usual the hook of this narrative; no temple-tax in its mouth has made it too difficult. Though, according to the structure of a fish's mouth, the difficulty in question is not so very great, yet it is not said that Peter would find the stater exactly between the teeth in the mouth of the fish. The opening of the mouth may here be supposed to signify the means of getting down to the lower part of the throat. For a fish to have a piece of money in its mouth is by no means wonderful; for 'there are accounts elsewhere of finding fishes that had coins and other valuables in their body.'² Nor would it be wonderful if Peter had accidentally taken such a fish with a stater in its body. The wonder (or miracle) lies in this, that Jesus distinctly assured Peter beforehand of such a fortunate capture. We need not call to mind the powerful action of metals as experienced

¹ According to Exod. xxx. 13, every Israelite was to give a half-shekel for the support of the tabernacle. According to Winer, this half-shekel originally (according to the standard of the sanctuary) was not quite four groschen. Josephus in his time valued the whole shekel at four drachms (above 21 groschen). The half-shekel is demanded in the Gospel as a double drachm; and two persons would therefore have to pay four drachms or one stater. [About three shillings and threepence of English money, according to Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.*; but, according to Jahn, two shillings and sevenpence.]

² Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 182.

by *clairvoyants*, in order to render this miracle in some measure conceivable with all its obscurity ; and in order to conjecture how Jesus knew this epicure of a fish that gulped down gold, and was so ready to take the bait. When Jesus found Himself reduced to the sheerest necessity, and when a stater was needed to fulfil an obligation, He learned in the mirror of God's Spirit where it was to be found. He needed only to feel in the depths of the sea in order to obtain the requisite piece of money. But here also too much attention has been paid to the outside of the miracle, and so an obscurity has been cast on the motive. The Lord was reminded by the officers of the temple, through Peter, of the temple-tax. This demand seemed likely to produce a collision, as we may infer from the conversation of Jesus with Peter. According to His essential relation to the temple, He was identical with the spiritual meaning of it ; the temple was only a faint outline of that habitation of God which His life exhibited. Or, according to the Israelitish law, the temple was God's fortress, the palace of His Father, and He was the child of the palace. But as His father's child, He was, of course, free from the tribute which the liege-subjects had to pay to His residence. If, then, Christ paid the temple-tax, He would not only deny the consciousness of His right relation to the temple, but He might confirm these Israelites in the false assumption that He owed tribute to the temple like a Jew who needed the Levitical sacrifice and atonement. Yet, if He did not pay the tribute, He might seem to the officers as if He slighted the law ; thus they might either be set against Him or against the law, to their own injury. Therefore they would be offended not only by the non-payment of the tax, but even if Jesus had paid it without hesitation. Neither on this occasion was a loan or a borrowing of friends to be thought of.¹ It is said, 'Lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea,' and then further directions are given ; as if it had been said, Let us adopt this expedient. Now the stater, in a literal sense, was neither more nor less than a stater though found in the jaws of a fish. The moral effect of the payment would be just the same. But even this Jesus seemed desirous of avoiding. This inner motive of the history is as it were its soul, and must determine its interpretation. Jesus wished, then, to discharge the temple-tax in a shape which allowed its payment to appear as a purely voluntary act. This he attained by presenting a natural object to the tax-gatherers, which with wonderful certainty He had caused to be taken fresh from the sea.

¹ It can hardly be imagined that in the whole circle of the friends of Jesus at Capernaum so small a sum could be wanting ; and if it were there, it would no doubt be at His service without the necessity of borrowing. It is below the dignity of New Testament life when one expositor protests that it would be unbecoming our Lord to borrow the amount from His friends, and when another thinks that there is no difficulty in admitting such a thing. It is the same poverty-struck region which a third has before his eyes, who supposes that Christ took possession of the twelve baskets of fragments as His own private property. What a picture ! On the one side, the disciples go off with twelve full bread-baskets, and the Master 'at their head ; and, on the other side, the satisfied people depart without carrying away a fragment of the miraculous meal.

According to this view, the expression, ‘As soon as thou openest the mouth of the fish, thou shalt find a stater,’ may be poetical, and mean, ‘As soon as thou hast taken the fish off the hook, thou shalt obtain for it the amount which they expect for Me and thee.’ This interpretation would be quite impossible if it were said, ‘Thou shalt find a stater in its mouth.’ These, however, are not the words. But though this interpretation is possible, it is very forced, since the expression of opening the fish’s mouth is a singular one, if it only means taking it off the hook. Moreover, it is said, ‘When thou hast opened its mouth, thou shalt *find* a stater.’ At all events, thus much is clear, that Jesus could not have intended that Peter was to catch as many fish as would fetch a stater in the market, and then give the amount to the tax-gatherers.¹ The disciple, with the first fish he caught, was to have the value of a stater; it might consist in catching a very large fish, or a rare and valuable one, or, lastly, one with a coin in its mouth. In either case the miracle remains the same. It was precisely the design of Jesus to exhibit His free power by the miraculous form of the deed. It was needful, therefore, for this form to appear to the tax-gatherers as a miracle, which it would if Peter informed them in what extraordinary manner he obtained the stater. But the transaction would be more striking and free if he gave them a fish that was worth a stater, and informed them that he had drawn it out of the sea for them at the Lord’s command. The serene energy and the miraculous insight with which Jesus instantly unravelled a complication of legal and moral difficulties—the majesty with which He laid His hand on the great treasury of Nature, that in voluntary love He might pay a tax—make this ‘fabulous specimen of stories about the sea’ appear as the brightest, most delightful gleam of a world of love, of the most peaceful and calm adjustments, and of the richest blessings,—of a world such as Christ found by His Spirit, and as it is destined to appear in the transformation of the earth.

But as the first glorification of Christ was connected with the prospect of His crucifixion, so the first glorification of the earth must precede the judgment of the world. We therefore now inquire after that miraculous sign by which the judicial power of Christ’s Spirit was directly made known. But though for all the other constituents of His universal agency we find a multitude of signs, yet for this great and awful constituent only one is given—*the cursing of the fig-tree*. We need not say a word to show that it could never enter the Lord’s thoughts to punish a fig-tree, or to vent His displeasure upon it. The Evangelists, also, were so far from entertaining such a thought, that it could as little occur to them to guard their account against the misrepresentations of a criticism which would rather find here the anger of an undisciplined child than the symbolical significant act of the Saviour of the

¹ As Dr Paulus explains the passage (*Leben Jesu*, I. ii. 17), the exposition of the words, ‘As soon as thou openest the mouth of the fish, thou shalt find a stater,’ as he has given it, might be accepted without denying the miracle.

world. That the act must have had a symbolical meaning, cannot fail to strike us. W. Hoffman justly remarks, ‘Let us read in Matthew and Mark what subject chiefly occupied Jesus at that time—what He said in the temple on the very day of the miracle : it was an announcement of the final destruction of the Jews, who had remained an unfruitful tree. Whether or not Jesus had already spoken of it on the way, the cursing in any case remains a symbolic act. It signified that, as certainly as the green leafy tree withered at the word of the Lord, so certainly would all the divine threatenings against Israel be fulfilled, though it appeared at that time to stand in such luxuriant growth.’¹ In those days Jesus foretold unheard-of judgments—how they would come on Jerusalem, on the land of Judea, and indeed on the whole earth—how they would come in His name, in retribution of their wanton rejection of Him, but also as a necessary purification of the world before the event of the resurrection. As the Prophet of judgment, He walked with profound sorrow among His disciples, filled with the thoughts of the coming judgments, while they could not give up the expectation of a transformation of the world without the preliminary terrors and sentences of judgment. They needed, therefore, a sign. Elijah might have devoted for the purpose part of the city of Jerusalem; Christ selected a tree. Criticism in vain assumes here the air of a forester or a gardener, and declaims about the injury done to the tree. With equal right the Lord might be made accountable for the destruction of Jerusalem. No curse is fulfilled without the co-operation of the sovereign God with the foretelling prophet. The Lord was hungry, and the tree seemed to invite Him by its abundant foliage. He went up to it, if perchance He might find some fruit, if only a single fig, upon it ; but in vain : there was nothing but leaves. *For it was not a good year for figs.*² Then Jesus uttered the words, ‘Let no fruit grow on thee henceforth for ever.’ The next day the tree was found withered. This miracle was a prognostic of that melancholy drought through the land which began some ten years after, during which the palm-trees disappeared, the fig-trees withered, and the springs were dried up. But how did Christ effect this miracle ? When, at a later period, Peter’s rebuke fell on Ananias like a flash of lightning, the

¹ [‘Not in the display of arbitrary power, for He had silenced the solicitations of the tempter ; not in the pressure of personal need, for this was forgotten at the well-side of Samaria ; but in terrible justice He spoke the words of condemnation. As He entered into Jerusalem, parable and miracle were combined in one work of judgment.’ Westcott, *Miracles*, p. 24.—ED.]

² ‘Of figs, which were an important article of food, three kinds were known in the East : (i.) the early fig, which was ripe at the end of June (perhaps still earlier about Jerusalem) ; (ii.) the summer-fig (Kermoos), which ripens in August ; (iii.) the winter-fig, a late Kermoos which ripens after the tree has shed its leaves, and in mild weather hangs till the spring.’—Winer, R. W. B. Mark’s expression, *οὐ γὰρ ἦν καίρος συκῶν*, may mean either it was not the time of the year for figs, or it was not a favourable year for figs. Taken in the former sense, it perhaps intimated not there was no reason to expect figs on the tree, but it was hardly to be expected. At all events, the second construction gives a better sense. Symbolically, all bad trees were punished in this one bad tree, and even the bad season.

explanation is obvious—that it struck the conscience of Ananias with deadly energy. But by what medium could this word of Christ pass through the tree and blast it in all its parts? In order to form a correct view on this point, we must bring before our minds the general judgment in all its significance. In the general judgment the aeonian administration of the Father coincides with the result of the aeonian agency of the Son; in other words, the ripeness of the present world for judgment, the ripeness of the earth for the harvest, coincides with the ripeness of the Church. For this reason the Father retains in His own power the time and hour of the end of world; and as He is now controlling the cosmical side of the end of the world as He judged Judea, especially in its relation to the history of the world, so here also He brought to view the first phenomenon of the incipient withering of the glory of Judea. God Himself, therefore, caused the tree to wither; but this was done with a reference to the judgment of Christ, His life and His language. The Father and the Son, therefore, performed this symbolical act in the most living unity. The word of Christ killed the tree, since, having been uttered by the operation of God, it appealed to God's operation, and accordingly with that penetrated destructively through the nature-sphere of the tree. It was a word from the eternal depths of Christ's life, in which the Son felt Himself altogether one with the Father. That lightning which will one day blaze from the east to the west, and set on fire all the old world, here blasted a perversely pretentious barren tree, and in its withering formed a prognostic of the final judgment. But to the disciples—who in the future could meet with no greater destruction than the outward, secularized Mount Zion, the barren pretentious Judaism—it gave the promise, that at their word of faith ‘this mountain’ (at all events, a mountain to which He pointed) ‘should be removed, and cast into the sea.’ The Lord, by a symbolical prognostic on a small scale, brought before their eyes that great judgment which was impending over Israel, when its national glory would be broken up and scattered among the nations (like the mountain cast into the sea). The disciples were thus taught that God met their faith in His judicial glory, and by His wonderful judgments would prepare the way for them as His own people to the glory that would be completed at the resurrection. Besides this miracle of the fig-tree, the darkening of the sun at the crucifixion, and the earthquake at the death of Christ, served to reveal the nature-side of the future judgment in awful omens. It was perfectly in keeping with the relation of Christ to the sphere of nature in the old world, that this sphere should be convulsed and darkened by the first presentiment of its future transformation at the hour when He sank in death. As all the operations of Christ first appeared in distinct single miracles, and then expanded their life in great and deep mediations, and finally were consummated in world-historical miracles, so was it with these miraculous signs which announced the last judgment. Their mediation lies in an

operation of the Spirit of Righteousness upon the earth, during which more critical phenomena of the last world's curse are continually appearing ; we might say, during which the combustibility of the earth, and the fermentation in the depths of its life, are evermore unfolding their adaptation for a metamorphosis.

But here we are contemplating the judgment of the world only as an introduction to the resurrection, with which it is closely connected, just as the individual resurrection of Christ was introduced by His death, in which He had experienced the judgment of the world in Himself. The final aim of Christ's work is the resurrection—the introduction of the whole Church of God into an incorruptible and manifested life, penetrated from eternity by the Spirit (1 Cor. xv.) That resurrection finds its deepest ground, the principle which makes it an organic certainty, in the individual resurrection of Christ. This resurrection of the Lord is unceasingly perpetuated in the Church as a living energy. The life of Christ operates according to its nature in the world, awakening, invigorating, healing, and restoring, since it is essentially eternal life, or positive vivifying life. It is therefore not to be thought something merely figurative, and to refer simply to spiritual awakenings, when the resurrection of Christ is regarded as an awakening of humanity victoriously continued and pervading the history of the world. In the same real comprehensive manner in which He combats sin, He combats death ; and with the same superiority which He displays in conquering sin, He completes His victory over death. He vivifies life, since He restores to it its intensive value ; He conserves life, since He weakens the powers of death ; He lengthens life, since He draws it always nearer the tree of life—nearer to a state conformable to the Spirit and to nature ; He renews life, since He imparts to the inner man the power of the resurrection. Now, where do we find the first blossoms of this immeasurable agency of Christ ? We find them in the three miracles which He performed, of restoring the dead to life.

The restoring of the dead to life is in itself so difficult a miracle that we cannot receive the instances of it unhesitatingly unless we are previously satisfied about the resurrection of Christ. If we are certain of Christ's resurrection, we have gained the superior principle, of which these miracles are to be regarded as easy developments.

In the miracle of restoring the dead to life we must hold fast as the principal point, that Christ, as the Prince of life, rules dynamically over the kingdom of the dead—that His voice can reach and penetrate the departing spirit in the slumber of its transition to another world, in the obscure depth of life through which it falls into the bosom of God. We experience every day the enigma, the apparent contradiction, that a person asleep, and so far not a hearer, can hear a person calling, and we know that he hears quickest when his own name is called. Sharper voices and sounds of alarm can even exert an awakening power on those who are soundly asleep or

quite stupefied. But no human lamentation awakens the dead. But how intensely powerful, how deeply penetrating and all-pervading, Christ's awakening voice must be, measured by the uniqueness of His person, by the decidedness of His will, by the certainty of His trust in God, and by the relationship of His life to the innermost life of the deceased! But where do we find the organic medium through which Christ's voice reaches the spirit of the dead? Thus much is clear, that the body of the deceased in its first state is very different from a mummy or mouldering corpse. There is, so to speak, a fresh-paved way between the corpse and the spirit that has forsaken it. Science also has already arrived at the conjecture, that the last tones of life in the corpse die away much more slowly than has been commonly represented. The corpse is still full of the remembrance of life; hence also, in general, the features of the deceased reappear in plastic beauty, the reflection, so to speak, of that healthfulness which strove against the crisis of disease, and gained the victory at the cost of sacrificing the life, a prognostic of the future life. But when so obscure a track seems to show itself on which Christ reaches the dead with His voice, the question arises, How can the departed return into the dead organism? But the power with which the spirit returns, with which it flies back into the organism in its unity with the power of Christ's word that called it, is to be regarded as the ray of life which again restores the organism. We must also here recollect that Christ did not resuscitate many dead persons without distinction in this miraculous manner, but only the individuals whose resuscitation was indicated to Him by the Father. Those who have supposed that Christ could not resuscitate the dead without regarding them as means for other objects, and encroaching on their already decided destiny, seem to have proceeded on the assumption that He performed His miracles without reference to the will of His Father. In this case the same remark might be made respecting His miraculous cures of the sick. But it was included in the destiny of the sick, that they were to be cured by Him (John ix. 3); so also it belonged to the destiny of the dead, that He was to resuscitate them (John xi. 4). In the successive steps by which these resuscitations of the dead follow one another, the power of Christ appears progressively more exalted.¹ First of all, He restores the maiden on her death-bed; then the young man on the bier; and lastly, Lazarus in the sepulchre.

But we see how in all these cases the Lord first of all combats the lamentations for the dead made by those who were around them,—how He quells the psychical desponding mood which surrounded the dead as if to ward off the approach of life, and then makes His way clear to the spirit of the deceased. ‘Fear not! only believe!’ He says to Jairus, the ruler of the synagogue. Then He makes a selection of those persons who were to be present at

¹ [Ewald sees something of the same progress in all Christ's works.—*Christus*, 226.—Ed.]

the resuscitation, namely, the disciples Peter, James, and John, and the parents of the child. Then He enters the house of mourning, and says to the people who were lamenting the dead, ‘ Why make ye this ado, and weep ? the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth (Mark v. 39). And they laughed Him to scorn.’ But He put them all out ; and thus by alarming the living, made the field free from the alarm of death. The call, ‘ Damsel, arise !’ impressed itself so suddenly in its original form, *Ταλιθὰ κοῦμι*, on the disciples, that Mark, who had a keen sense of the exciting, could not help inserting it in his Gospel. At the resuscitation of the young man at Nain, this preliminary combat of the life-restorer was shown by two signs ‘ Weep not !’ He said to the mourning mother, and thus not merely consoled, but raised her into the bright circle of His own state of mind. Then He came nearer and laid hold of the bier,¹ and the bearers stood still (Luke vii. 14). This demonstration, of which the energy is reflected in the narrative, stopped the advancing procession of the mourners ; and then followed the joyful resuscitation. At the resurrection of Lazarus, Jesus sought first of all to raise the dejected heart of Martha. But when Mary and the Jews (the friends of the family) met Him weeping, ‘ He groaned in spirit, and was troubled.’² With mighty indignation He set Himself against the waves of despondency which beat upon her breast ; and without delay betook Himself to the grave. Once more there was a strong internal movement of His soul to repel a fresh attack of despondency. All the words which He uttered afterwards had the same design, to prostrate death first in the hearts of the bystanders. This striving serves to explain the form of the prayer which Jesus offered at the grave, and which some have thought strange and repulsive, because they have not taken notice of the internal conflict which of necessity preceded the act of resuscitation, and occasioned the Lord’s uttering aloud His address to the Father. The moment is difficult, serious, and decisive. Jesus cries with a loud voice, ‘ Lazarus, come forth !’ The Evangelist, with the most vivid remembrance of the scene, selects the strongest terms, in order to exhibit the striking effect of that awakening call of Christ.

Although the Lord recalled the dead whom He resuscitated to the present life without transporting them to an imperishable life, yet these restorations constitute the miracles by which He most decidedly displayed His majesty. In significance they are of the same order as His own resurrection, and with the future resurrection of the dead. They reveal the power of the Prince of life to abolish death, that is, to bear aloft all individual life according to its innermost nature and destiny from the depths of nature-life into His own ideality, and to exhibit it in that. For as far as the tide of death breaks over individuality with the appearance of destruc-

¹ Ἡψατο τῆς σοροῦ : He seized, took possession of the bier.

² From the close connection in which Christ’s state of mind appeared to be with that of the mourners, the meaning of these words (John xi. 33) can be more precisely explained, than would be possible without a reference to this connection.

tion, death seems to pollute man in his sacred individuality. Wherefore it is said, 'Thou wilt not suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption,' and the resurrection of Christians is one with His own glorification. In the miracles of raising the dead, Christ unfolds the boundlessness of His might over individuals, and of individuals over the change to dust; they are the crown of His miracles.

Besides the miraculous acts of Jesus reported by the Evangelists, He appears generally,¹ and especially at Capernaum,² to have performed many other wonderful works. But yet He was very far from allowing His miracles to appear with the profusion of everyday events. He decidedly set Himself against the craving for miracles. The opinion so commonly entertained, about the fondness of that age for miracles, has little to support it. Had it been prevalent in Israel, the people would hardly have reverenced as a great prophet,³ a man without the gift of miracles, John the Baptist. But as to their conduct towards Jesus, the case was different. As soon as the Jews believed that they had discovered in Him Messianic features, as soon as He gave any sign whatever, the craving for miracles which had faintly glimmered in their breasts burst forth into a flame, and they were ever longing for new and greater signs. The modern shyness for miracles has sought with great eagerness after those expressions of Jesus in which He checked the craving for miracles, in order to prove from them that He wrought no miracles, or at least that He regarded them as of little importance. But such a forced interpretation of the words of Jesus may be safely left to the impression it gives of its utter worthlessness. It is very clear from the Gospel history, that the Lord shaped His conduct in the spirit with a constant reference to the belief in miracles prevailing in His time, that is, He treated every particular case according to its peculiar character. But in this unrestricted diversity of treatment, three methods are distinctly prominent in His conduct. In those cases in which He could reckon on unlimited confidence in the persons who needed His help, He rendered aid without any hesitation; indeed, He often brought them aid quite unexpectedly. But when He found that they were in danger of apprehending the miracle superstitiously, of losing sight of His own personality in the astonishment excited by the fact, or of seeking the miracle only as a common outward help, then He kept Himself aloof, and blamed them. 'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe' (John iv. 48). But if this tendency to bring His miracles into the service of selfishness was decidedly apparent, He entirely refused to gratify such expectations. He would not allow Himself to be taken for a bread-knife (John vi. 26), nor a court performer of miracles (Luke xxiii. 8); and as little would He satisfy the chiliastic Pharisees when they demanded of Him a miraculous sign in accordance with their views of the world. It was in the spirit of diametric opposition between His christological world and theirs, when to meet their desire that

¹ John xxi. 25.

² Luke iv. 23.

³ Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 140 [Bohn].

He would accredit His mission by a chiliastic sign of the Messiah suited to their notions, He made a reference to the sign of His death (John ii. 18, 19). The sign with which His Messianic kingdom was to come into the world was His cross; while they were under the delusion that the Messiah must immediately begin His universal sovereignty under a cosmical sign.¹ He always pointed to this sign of His death whenever they demanded from Him the cosmical sign of the new æon.² He declared that only one sign should be given them, the sign of the prophet Jonah. From this declaration it cannot follow in the least, that He had done no miracle, or that His adversaries had never been present at such an act; for the question about which He was treating was the sign which, according to the Jewish chiliastic preconceptions, must at once satisfy the nation that the Messiah was come. The Evangelist Mark explains this declaration of Christ as equivalent to there shall no sign at all be given them. On the other hand, in Luke, Jonah himself, with his preaching, is regarded as the true sign for the Ninevites. But Matthew gives the *thought* in full. ‘For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth’ (Matt. xii. 40). The three Evangelists have preserved the different sides of the interpretation of a mysterious saying. Mark gives prominence to the negative in the language of Jesus: He would grant no sign to His adversaries in the sense they attached to it. Luke specifies the reason: they ignored the great sign from heaven that was continually exhibited before their eyes in His life; although the heathen Ninevites were awakened to repentance by Jonah, a poor foreigner; and although an Arabian queen was attracted from a distance to Jerusalem by the wisdom of Solomon. But Matthew has preserved the words which occasioned our Lord to speak precisely of the sign of Jonah. Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, apparently beyond recall, and lost to Nineveh and the world: so also shall it be with the Son of man. The Jews required a sign from heaven, but a sign from quite an opposite quarter was to be given them: one rising from the depths of the earth, from suffering and death, from reproach and neglect; first of all in the history of Jesus Himself, then in the world-historical course of His Church. This is the sign of the Christian æon, the crucifixion of Christ, as through the resurrection it has been proclaimed to the world. But this sign is to be a critical one for the world—to many, a sign of death, and to many, a sign of life and redemption. The crucifixion of Christ in connection with His resurrection has become the great sign of the new Christian æon; a sign before which all single miracles appear inconsiderable, like the hillocks at the foot of a lofty mountain. As soon as we are certain of the fact of Christ’s resurrection, we find in all miracles only a gentle prelude to this

¹ The greatness and importance of this contrast leads to the correct interpretation of John ii. 18, 19, that is, it confirms John’s exposition.

² Compare Matt. xii. 38-42; Luke xi. 29-31; Matt. xvi. 1-4; Mark viii. 12.

great hymn of ideal reality. Hence it is evident that we who find ourselves under the living operation of the resurrection, in the midst of the life-stream proceeding from it, in the natural unfolding and expansion of the greatest of all miracles, cannot possibly expect to witness such miracles in detail as Christ performed before His resurrection. Since the Spirit of Christ is in the most vigorous action, making all the blind to see, and removing bodily blindness in its root, He can no longer expend His power in performing a few single miracles of this kind. And so it is with the other miracles of Christ. In the miracle of the reconciliation of the world, which He accomplishes, He lays the foundation for its resurrection. From what has been said, it is also evident that everywhere on the border territory where Christianity comes into sharp conflict with the pre-Christian earthly life, events resembling miracles, or actually miraculous, may make their appearance. Thus the disciples received from the Lord the gift of performing miracles ; this gift consisted in a preponderance of the Christian spirit, especially of the confidence of faith, which raised them above the despondency and bondage to nature belonging to their times. By His blessing their faith, He placed them in such a relation to His own miraculous power, that they could cast out demons in His name (Matt. x. 1; Luke x. 17). By their miraculous deeds, they extended the circle of the first direct operation of Christ upon the world. Also, in the vast extension of Christianity in the middle ages, not merely extraordinary, but even miraculous operations of Christian power, made their appearance, though not invested with the glory of the original Christian spiritual life. And so also the miracles of Christ must return, when the passage of the new Christian æon through the old is completed with the final outburst of the spirit at the end of the days. Then too Christ will give His adversaries the Messianic sign from heaven which they formerly demanded ; but at the sight of it, all the tribes of the earth shall mourn. But in proportion as the great miracle of the new world unfolds itself as the effect of Christ's life, it must become manifest, that His single miracles, not only as immediate evangelical facts, but as the subjects of evangelical announcement, were only single, gentle modes of bringing His divine power into communication with the life of the world.

NOTES.

1. A distinct progression in the dogmatic development of the conception of miracle may be observed, which appears accompanied by an increasing obscuration of it. The biblical designations, *σημεῖα*, *δυνάμεις*, *τέρατα*, and *ἐργα*, jointly rest on the most living, most immediate contemplation, and the most correct estimate of the facts. Miracles as *σημεῖα* point to the one fundamental power of the principle from which they proceed, and they are referable to it, because they are mediated by a higher nature—a higher spirit-life—a divine revelation of which they testify. But since they extend themselves as *δυνάμεις*, as so many rays of the original *δύναμις* from which they

are produced, they appear as overpowering, supernatural principles, which, in conformity to their power, display themselves in their irruption through a lower sphere of nature. But this irruption is effected by breaking through the wonted limits, circles, and presuppositions of the old nature-life as *τέρατα*, as agitating, unheard-of events. But by their course, their operation and results, they prove themselves to be the noblest works of the Spirit, or of pure love. Every miracle has all these sides and designations ; but, according to the varieties of susceptibility, some persons see more of one side, and some of another. The heathenish superstitious mind stops short at the *τέρας* ; the strangeness of the miracle frightens him, and when he begins to doubt, the relative anti-naturalism irritates him. The believing Israelitish mind sees in a miracle the *σημεῖον*, the mediated sign of the forthcoming kingdom of God. The firmly established Christian mind beholds in these miracles the powers that unfold themselves from the divine power of Christ, *δυνάμεις*, as they begin overpoweringly in their first vigorous operations to form a new world in the old ; the perfected Christian mind (like John) sees in them simply the works of Christ, the *ἔργα*, as they appear to him perfectly natural, and the life-manifestations of Christ's glory, transforming nature. In Augustin's times, the opinion that miracles were contrary to nature already existed, but was impugned by Augustin. To him all things were a miracle as far as they proceeded from God's omnipotence, and all things were nature as far as they were constituted by the will of God, who created nature. But he distinguishes in life itself between miracle and nature, since he contrasts the extraordinary with ordinary nature. 'Omnia portenta contra naturam dicimus esse, sed non sunt. Quomodo est enim contra naturam quod Dei fit voluntate, quum voluntas tanti utique conditoris conditae rei cujusque natura sit. Portentum ergo fit non contra naturam, sed contra quam est nota natura—quamvis et ipsa quæ in rerum natura omnibus nota sunt, non minus mira sint essentque stupenda considerantibus cunctis, si solerent homines mirari nisi rara.'—*De Civit. Dei*, xxi. 8. Augustin has at the same time a distinct feeling of the mediation by which miracle is effected, namely, the resurrection and ascension of Christ. 'Legebantur enim præconia præcedentia prophetarum, concurrebant ostenta virtutum, et persuadebatur veritas nova consuetudini, non contraria rationi, donec orbis terræ, qui persequebatur furore, sequeretur fide.'—*De Civit. Dei*, xxii. 7. The schoolmen elevated the conception of miracle, since they distinguish between *mirabilia* and *miracula*. By a miracle, properly so called, Thomas Aquinas understood what goes beyond the order of all created nature, in which sense God alone performs a miracle. In this definition the supernatural in miracle is brought to its strongest expression, but yet the conception is not overstrained ; it only wants the satisfying mediation. Aquinas gives, indeed, a kind of mediation, by connecting the contemplation of *mirabilia* with the definition of *miracula*. 'Non sufficit ad rationem miraculi, si aliquid fiat

praeter ordinem alicujus naturæ particularis, sic enim aliquis miraculum faceret lapidem sursum projiciendo ; ex hoc autem aliquid dicitur miraculum, quod fit praeter ordinem totius naturæ creatæ quo sensu solus deus facit miracula. Nobis non est omnis virtus naturæ creatæ nota, cum ergo fit aliquid praeter ordinem naturæ creatæ nobis notæ per virtutem creatam nobis ignotam, est quidem miraculum quoad nos, sed non simpliciter' (*Summa Theol.* lib. i. qu. 110, art. 4). On these definitions, through which the ideal contemplation of the object, though obscure, is sufficiently discernible, the Lutheran theologians especially proceeded at a later period, when they raised the relative anti-naturalism of a miracle to absolute anti-naturalism, and then made this overstrained *moment* the only definition of the conception of a miracle. Besides the definition quoted from Buddeus, that from Quenstedt may prove this : 'Miracula vera et proprie dicta sunt, quæ contra vim rebus naturalibus a deo inditam, cursumque naturalem, sive per extraordinariam dei potentiam efficiuntur' (*Systema Theol.* p. 471. Compare Hase, p. 202 ; Hahn, *Lehrbuch des chr. Glaubens*, p. 23). To this view the philosophy of Leibnitz forms a counterpoise, since it defines a miracle as 'aliquid cursui naturæ ordinario non autem essentiae illius entis, in quo contingit (quoniam absolute impossibilia fieri nequeunt) contrarium' (*Dissert. prælim. ad Theodic. &c., § 2, 3.* Compare Rixner, *Handbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie*, iii. 179). In modern times, some Church theologians have attempted to maintain the conception of miracle by dropping the strictly *miraculum* and retaining only the *mirabile*. Among these, J. Müller especially reckons Schleiermacher. Certainly Schleiermacher, in his *Glaubenslehre*, § 47, has made the assertion, that every absolute miracle must disturb the whole framework of nature ; on the other hand, he also remarks, that 'since our knowledge of created nature is contained in its *progressive manifestation*, we have the less right to hold anything whatever to be impossible.' The tortuous and obscure expressions of Schleiermacher on this subject proceed from this—that, on the one hand, he recognized Christ as 'the summit of miraculous agency,' while, on the other hand, the Spinozist or naturalistic conception of the monotonous rigid sphere of nature confronted him. What Schleiermacher has advanced with special cogency, is the entrance of miracle into nature—its appearance in a natural course ; and this is a decided gain, for by it the last element of the conception of miracle is firmly fixed. And if we look back, we find in its history the actual unfolding of all its component parts, though charged with one-sidedness and extravagance in the views taken of it. Augustin advocates the *mediation* of miracle ; Aquinas its supernaturalness ; Quenstedt its anti-naturalness ; and, lastly, Schleiermacher its new nature. Weisse (i. 369) makes a distinction between *wonders* and *miracles*, and understands by the former, exertions of Christ's power which 'may be referred to the conception of a peculiar organic endowment,' and by the latter, such acts of which the conception would be 'the purely negative of going

beyond the common course of nature, of breaking through the laws of this course of nature.' These miracles—for example, those of feeding the multitudes—must have arisen from a mere misunderstanding of the parabolic discourses of the Lord. This view rests on the ignoring of the new æon, which we have already sufficiently characterized.¹

2. Göthe has contemplated and exhibited with the greatest admiration the ascending scale which is presented in the life of nature, though he wished also to recognize the scientific designation of nature in an ascending movement; as the passage quoted by Tholuck from Göthe's *Doctrine of Colours* expresses it: 'As on the one hand experience is boundless, since it can always discover something new, so are the maxims throughout, since they cannot stiffen nor lose the capability of expanding and embracing a plurality, and even of consuming and losing themselves in a higher view.'

3. As the attenuation of the conception of miracle is connected on the one hand with the attenuation of the doctrine of the person of Christ, so is it on the other hand with the attenuation of the eschatology. Those who, from their narrow dogmatic system, which has been contracted under the influence of philosophy, have rejected the æonian yonder world of space and time, the heavens and the new world—to whom, therefore, the idea of the future transformation of the world is wanting—have with it lost the general Christian view of the universe which alone is suited to prepare the way for the conception of miracle.

4. The human hand is the twofold organ of those activities of the spirit which are exercised and developed in the sphere of ordinary life, and of its dynamico-mysterious activities. It acts as an organ of the psychico-somatic operations of this kind in the function of the magnetizer; as an organ of pneumatico-psychical operations in ordination; lastly, as an organ of the pneumatico-psychical-somatic operations in the whole energy of the life of the God-man in Christian miracles. The physical basis of these operations has in all probability become known by a new discovery. In a work entitled, *Ueber die Pacinischen Körperchen an den Nerven des Menschen und der Säugethiere* von J. Henle und A. Kölliker, Zurich, bei Meyer und Zeller, 1844 (*On the Pacinian Corpuscles in the Nerves of Man and the Mammalia*, by J. Henle and A. Kölliker), the important discovery made by Pacini, a physician of Pistola, almost contemporaneously with others, is described and scientifically examined. Pacini discovered first of all, in the sensible nerves of the hand, small elliptical whitish corpuscles; also in the nerves of the soles of the feet. He began to prosecute the discovery in the animal kingdom; but found none in the dromedary, and few in the ox. So far as the discovery has been followed out by the editors of the above-mentioned work, these

¹ [Upwards of forty definitions of miracle by the highest authorities are collected in the Appendix to Alexander's *Christ and Christianity*. More recently the subject has been taken up by Baden Powell (*Essays and Reviews*); and in answer to him, from different points of view, by Mansel, Heurtley, Lee, and Davies. On the interruption of the regular course of nature by a power extraneous to it, see Mill's *Mythical Interpretation*, p. 81, and Bushnell's *Nature and the Supernatural*.—ED.]

corpuscles are found (besides in men) in all the domestic mammalia hitherto examined ; they are wanting in all birds, amphibia, and fishes. In particular cases some of these corpuscles are found in men, scattered in the nerves of the arms and legs, and in the region of the abdomen. They are found in the greatest number and with the most regular recurrence in the human extremities, and in cats in the diaphragm. In the human extremities, according to the drawing, they adorn the ramifications of the nerves of the skin, as fruit the branches of a tree. This is not the place for a more minute description of the corpuscles. From their general appearance, Pacini has been induced to compare them to the electrical organs of the torpedo, and to describe them as animal magneto-motors, and to refer them as organs to the phenomena of animal magnetism. The authors of the work above quoted make the following remark on Pacini's discoveries : ' It must not surprise us if the adherents of animal magnetism, who are not altogether extinct with us, seize hold of these statements with eagerness and turn them to account. Only let us beg them to extend their manipulations to the epigastric region of cats, which, by reason of their ample magnetic apparatus, promise very interesting facts.' But we need only to recollect the difference between the flesh of cats and human flesh to perceive that this remark is only a joke. This distinction has indeed been firmly maintained in the mediaeval fantastic relation between cats and witches, and the new discovery may perhaps contribute to its explanation. It is perfectly natural that the magnetism of the cat should be there for the sphere of the feline vocation, and perhaps serves for the purpose of its holding the magic-bound mouse outside its hole and playing with it. How far below the cat is the torpedo, since with its electricity it immediately strikes and benumbs its victim ! This is indeed the rudest first trace of animal magnetism. The magnetizer, on the contrary, stands in the dignity of humanity incalculably higher than the cat in the application of his power, though even in his case the operation on the susceptible is obscure and magical, and the connection of the magnetized with him remains more or less a case of natural attraction (*Gebundenheit*). Magnetic connections of this kind are indeed, under the more general form, present in life in a thousand different modes, and may form themselves, especially in particular circumstances. But when the same power appears again in the prophetic region, it is transformed by the consecration of the ethical spirit, and operates only as a heavenly power, not disposing to sleep, but awakening,—not bewitching, but setting at liberty. The elementary flash, which even in the life's manifestation of the torpedo leads to death, is here changed throughout into a vivifying operation of life. The authors of the above-mentioned works find themselves induced to regard these corpuscles 'as a kind of electrical organs.' But it is obvious in such a case, that the human electrical organs, in their nature and operation, must contain and exhibit the specifically human in its whole extent. It is in this respect to

be carefully noted that these corpuscles are not found in all individuals in equal number and strength. This diversity in their allotment may indeed be considered as the foundation of the most different endowments. As to what concerns furnishing the sole of the human foot with these electrical organs, we are reminded by them not merely of the rhythmical structure of the human body, especially the feet, and the ecstatic dances as they occur among enthusiasts, of the not sinking of somnambulists in water, or of their ability to use the soles of their feet as organs of perception, but also of the ancient miraculous art of healing by means of the soles of the feet. Tacitus, after mentioning the fact that the Emperor Vespasian was applied to by a blind man in Alexandria to cure him by means of his spittle, reports that another sick person (prompted like the former by the god Serapis) requested that he might cure his diseased hand by contact with the sole of his foot; and so it really came to pass. It is unquestionably of great significance that these corpuscles, which have been compared to the Voltaic pile, have been discovered exactly in those parts of the human organism which, from a remote age, have been regarded as the life-points of a mysterious magical power.

5. In reference to the Demonology of the ancients, we have to make the following remarks. The conception of $\deltaαιμων$ or of $\deltaαιμόνιον$ (a word in which the impersonal, substituted for the demon, the demoniacal influence is indicated) embraces generally the representation of spirits belonging to the other world, as far as they make themselves known in this world by operations, fatalities, appearances, and living forms (while altogether opposite, the genius seems to denote the light-image of the other world, the ideal, life-image reflecting itself in the style of the other world, of an appearance of this world, of a man or a place). Also, the peculiar innermost nature of man can consequently come forward demoniacally when it exhibits itself in a dark power which breaks through its everyday life-form, so that the man himself in these moments stands there as a stranger. But when the ideal of his life comes so powerfully into visible manifestation, in this case the conception of demon and genius coincide; although here the genius maintains a peculiar relation to the Spirit of God sending or placing him; the demon, on the contrary, holds a special relation to the breaking of the innermost life through the form of the common life. Now it is not altogether a correct assertion, that the Greeks reckoned among the demons generally only departed human spirits, manes, lemures, and the like. The Greeks had also a superhuman dark kingdom of demons. Göthe has brought this forward in the second part of his *Faust*, and at the same time given the reason why the Grecian spirit placed these dark spirits, the Lamiæ and Gorgons, in the background of its mythology — ‘Phœbus, beauty’s friend, drives away into holes these births of night, or restrains them.’ As this is the manner of the sunny day, so it was also of the Grecian sense of the Beautiful. Yet certainly the Greeks, ‘especially when they spoke of possessions, connected

the notion of departed human souls with the words *δαιμῶν* and *δαιμόνιον*.’ (See Riegler, *Leben Jesus Christus*, i. 836.) As with the Greeks departed souls predominated among the demons, though superhuman demons were not wanting; so with the Jews the fallen angels predominated among the demons, though there was an intermixture of departed souls. That merely the souls of the giants, which probably from the narrative in Gen. vi. have been considered as the children of fallen angels, and the great transgressors before and immediately after the flood, were in this manner numbered with the angel-demons (see Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 12), cannot be admitted, since among the Jews the doctrine of the kingdom of the dead (Isa. xiv. 9), the injunction not to interrogate the dead (Deut. xviii. 11), and the assumption of the possibility of their return, were expressed without that limitation (1 Sam. xxviii. 8; Isa. xxix. 4; Matt. xiv. 2). That Josephus in his views attached himself to what predominated in the Grecian view, since he speaks of (*De Bello Jud.* vii. 6, 3) the demons as the spirits of wicked men, proves, at all events, that this theory did not in the least contradict the Jewish consciousness. The opinion that they were the souls of deceased men, has also been expressed by the earliest fathers who have treated of the subject of demons, namely, Justin Martyr and Athenagoras. ‘Tertullian appears to have been the first who took a different view, since he maintained that fallen spirits or devils falsely pretended in possessed persons that they were the souls of men deceased.’ Since among the Greeks it was the popular opinion that ‘the souls of those who died a violent death were demons,’ so Chrysostom endeavoured, especially in order to redeem the honour of the martyrs, to destroy the old popular representation. (See Riegler, i. 850.) The New Testament does not express itself more precisely respecting the nature of demons. That they are considered as belonging to the household of Satan (Matt. xii. 25), does not in the least decide that it does not include the souls of deceased wicked men among the demons. At all events, according to John viii. 44, the children of the devil belong as such to his household, although they were found among living men. If we carefully examine the Old Testament view, as it precedes the New Testament, and that of the early Church as connected with it, it is in the highest degree improbable that the Evangelists could mean by demons exclusively either evil angels or wicked deceased men.

6. When the cures of demoniacs as effected by Christ are termed ‘conjurations,’ the difference has not been observed between the agency of a master-mind who effects the expulsion of demons by the energy of his nature with fresh and free words of life, and the agency of a contracted exorcist who is bound to a traditional hypothesis, to the expectation of the co-operation of higher spirits, and to an unbending formula. Between conjuration and the Christian casting out of devils there is a similar difference, wide as the poles asunder, as between a common anecdote and the facts of the Gospel history.

7. Strauss (ii. 181) collects the outward similarities in the miracles

of the sea that are so characteristically different, called by him sea-anecdotes. ‘After they are set in order, each one is connected with the following by a common feature. The narrative of the calling of the fishers of men (Matt. iv. 18) opens the series; with this the narrative of Peter’s draught of fishes has in common the saying respecting fishers of men, but the fact of the draught of fishes is peculiar to it. This latter recurs in John xxi., where, in addition, there is the standing of Jesus on the shore, and the swimming to it of Peter. This standing and swimming appear parallel to the walking on the sea (Matt. xiv. 22, &c.)’ The author has forborne to complete his explanation of the significance of these similarities, as the connection of his work required. A gigantic sea-myth seems to have floated before him—a real sea-serpent—which perhaps was not delineated, because the Galilean sea seemed too small for such a mythic monster of the ocean.

8.¹ Mainly with reference to Dr F. Krummacher’s review in his ‘*Palm-blättern*’ (March, 1845) has it become imperatively necessary to discuss the question, whether, according to the rigid supernaturalism of the present day, Christ’s human nature must be regarded as amalgamated with and lost in His divine nature, or whether the modern free-believing theology has a right to assert the distinction of the two natures in Christ, and is justified in indicating the human element as co-operating with the divine in His miracles. Krummacher seems from the first to proceed entirely on the monophysite theory, though quite unconsciously and without any heterodox design. When I speak of the accompaniment of a magnetic fluid (more correctly a super-magnetic power), a spiritual-corporeal affinity (*Rapport*), and of a plastic human spirit in the miraculous works of Jesus, Krummacher asserts that the immediate and creatively interfering power of God must be entirely passed by. It would be as logically inferred that, by admitting that the Son of God is come in the flesh, the divinity of Christ is denied. Dare we and should we speak of the reality of His flesh and blood, yea, of eating His flesh and blood? It is at least our right, and indeed, even more, our duty, to keep in view the distinctive qualities of His human nature in their union with the great self-determinations of His divine creative power as they appear in the miracles. Or must the article of our faith, that the Word became flesh, remain for all time unopened, undeveloped? Must the human with the divine form a contradiction even in the life of Christ the God-man?

Krummacher is disposed indeed to gather from my representation of the gradual unfolding of Christ’s human nature, that I do not acknowledge His eternal divinity. The way and manner in which he arrives at this result I will here expose, in order to give a sample of his critical report on my theology, and with that I shall here close the discussion. I believe that in my work I have shown that the incarnation of God which was historically fulfilled in Christ Jesus,

¹ [This note forms the larger portion of the preface to the third volume of the original.—ED.]

was an eternal one, of which the future completion in Christ was revealed and objectively presented to the Old Testament seers in the Angel of the Presence. From this Krummacher draws the conclusion (p. 155): 'Lange's Christ existed before the foundation of the world only as an idea in God, not as a person with God.' And further on he identifies this Christ with the Son of God, that he may then say, 'He knows nothing of the Son of God begotten before all time, as the personal image of God.' Krummacher is very confident in this assertion, for he goes on to say, 'The expression of our Lord Himself, "Before Abraham was, I am," is then to be explained in the following manner: "I was before I was an I (*ein Ich*), already regarded as the Son of man in God, as becoming the Son of God in the ardent longing of men."' In passing, I must here beg the reviewer to be on his guard against the thoughtless use of marks of quotation. Every reader who is familiar with their use would believe that the reviewer, with the words 'I was before I was an I,' &c., had quoted an assertion of mine; but he would be quite mistaken. I beg the courteous reader to read my explanation of the passage quoted by Krummacher, John viii. 58—an explanation which had been in print long before I had seen the exposition thrust upon me by the reviewer—and then judge how far he proves himself to be a trustworthy reporter of the meaning of my Christology. In my Dogmatics I teach most decidedly the essential Trinity in opposition to the economical and Sabellian. Krummacher himself derives his information from passages in which the eternity of the Son is plainly enough taught (i. 37, ii. 45, &c.) How comes he then to maintain that I know nothing of the eternal Son of God? I regret to say it: it is because he does not distinguish between the idea of the historical, or, generally speaking, of the personal Christ, and the idea of the Son of God. In all my writings I teach and assume the eternity of the Son of God; but with that I do not teach that the personal Christ has existed from all eternity as such. For He it is who in the fulness of time appeared as the God-man, or the Son of man anointed with the fulness of the Godhead. But Krummacher thinks that I must teach this in order to be orthodox, and does not surmise that in doing so I must go further in heterodoxy than the ancient Archimandrite Eutyches. Indeed, in speaking of a personal Christ, any one would be mistaken if he were inclined to designate the pre-historical Christ, who certainly is ideal, as merely ideal, and ignore His substantial existence. This would be sheer Nestorianism, from which I know that I am most decidedly free. Krummacher indeed asserts, that what stands written in John xvii. 5 of the glory of the Lord must be taken, according to my view, in an ideal and not in an ontological sense. But from this he absolves me on the next page by the remark, that the unfolding (*werden*) of the christological life under the Old Covenant, was, according to me, not merely formal, but at the same time substantial. Or what difference should there still exist between the ontological and the substantial sense, in opposition to the conception of the merely ideal

on the one hand, and of the historical on the other? It is only needful to be tolerably familiar with my christological view to find that I speak of the ideal Christ as contradistinguished from the historical; but that I hold the eternal ontological being of Christ with a totally different emphasis from that of those theologians who, after the fashion of the older Dogmatic, see in the Angel of the Presence simply a super-earthly peculiar individuality in which the predicates *Angel* and Uncreated Essence are to be connected in a mysterious manner. But if Krummacher was not familiar with the distinctions between the *substantial* and the *historical* Christ, and between the conceptions *Christ* and *Son of God*, he must, as a reporter respecting christological investigations of the present day, fall into misunderstandings and misrepresentations. It is to be wished that he had spared himself the pain which must result from such public unfairness. The details I must reserve for a special answer to his attack. In the meantime I consider him responsible for all the scandal which may arise from the controversy thus forced upon me. I do not mean that I was troubled by his announcement, that he would assist the reader to determine whether 'Lange's book is to be deemed a step forwards or backwards in theology.' I could wish with all calmness, for his sake and my own, and more than all for the sake of the subject which the book advocates in a defective manner, that he would clear up this question. But the conflict in which I find myself engaged with a genial, bold, and long-loved preacher of the Gospel, pains me much, not only on personal considerations, but such as relate to the Church. Yet perhaps this controversy is one of the preliminary skirmishes, occurring here and there, of that warfare which the believing, scientific theology must wage with the mass of monophysitic (abstract supranaturalistic) representations in our Church before the way of the future is again quite cleared for the confession of the Church. May our warfare be carried on Christianly and nobly under the inspection of the Lord, and lead to a blessed result!

SECTION X.

THE TEACHINGS OF CHRIST, ESPECIALLY THE PARABLES.

Christ stood in the world with the pure heart, and so with the pure, simple vision, of the Man from heaven. Therefore He beheld God in spirit, His own Father. His course of life was in the perfect light of God, which was concentrated in Him, and made Him the Light of the world. The divine decree shone upon His soul like the clear daylight. But He beheld men in the world erring and perplexed, enchanted in ruinous delusion through the dazzling lights and shadows which sin forms from the light of the eternal train of beings in the universe, and through the spirit and world-destroying influence of selfishness (*Egoismus*). He saw them lost and walking in darkness; therefore He was continually striving to enlighten them by the light of His Spirit. And since the light

easily becomes to those in darkness 'a deeper night,' it was always His task to mediate the life of His Spirit, as the light of the world, with the life of the world's thoughts.

When truth takes the form of mediating, it becomes teaching (doctrine). The teacher as such is a mediator between the light that is entrusted to him and the eyes of the spirit which he has to illuminate with this light. He must construct a bridge between the heights of knowledge and the low level of germinating thought. But as Christ is generally the Mediator between God and humanity, so is He also specially, as a teacher, the Mediator between the divine counsels and human thought. He is the Teacher: this is involved in His whole character; this He proves by His ministry and operations.

In discharging His office of Teacher, He employs various forms of teaching, as they suited the various relations in which He stood to His hearers, and the inner constitution of these hearers themselves.

When He first of all met with men who had not yet entered into close discipleship with Him, the form of His teaching is dialogue, a distinct interchange with those around Him in accordance with social life. In this dialogical interchange He particularly engaged when He had to do with adversaries. Hence it is evident why this form predominates in the Gospel of John; for John made it his special task to exhibit the most important conflicts between the Prince of Light and the children of darkness. The dialogical words of Christ were in the highest degree important, full of life, and therefore abounding in similitudes. But if the men who heard Him entered into more definite intercourse with Him, He proceeded to the use of other modes of teaching. He then spoke to them in parables, in adages or maxims, or in the free spiritual form of thought, in the form of didactic discourse.

The relation between the thought and its sensible representation is always different in these three forms of teaching. In the parable the sensible representation decidedly predominates, and the thought retires into the background, although for thoughtful hearers it speaks through the powerful imagery of the parable. In the adage (*Gnome*) the image appears in living unity with the thought, the one penetrated by the other. Lastly, in didactic discourse the thought predominates, yet figurative allusions sparkle throughout the whole current of the discourse, in a manner suitable to the most living and richest spiritual utterances. We should now have to consider these three forms of teaching in the order stated, if it were not our business to dwell some time longer on the symbols. This will lead us to consider, in the first place, the two latter forms of teaching. Their contrast to the first decides this arrangement. We first of all see by what mode of teaching Christ mediated the truth among the consecrated and initiated, and then how He mediated it among the uninitiated.

In the circle of those hearers who had a peculiar susceptibility for His doctrine, and followed Him with personal regard to the lonely mountain district, whom He therefore could regard as con-

secrated, Jesus taught many times in adages or religious maxims, in apophthegms which presented great truths in sharp, fresh, luminous forms, which oftentimes are more or less symbolic.¹ The adage forms a sentence enclosed in itself and rounded off, the form of which is expressed with the sharpness and freshness of life like an accomplished human individuality, and its thought profoundly ideal and rich like the essence of a human personality, and in which this deep thought constitutes with this beautiful form a living unity like soul and body in an animated, speaking human countenance. The entire adage is form, and yet again it is altogether thought; a thought in luminous freshness; as in a precious stone the matter, the form, and the light appear in noble unity. With such jewels or pearls Christ presented the consecrated among His hearers.

But to the initiated who had become His friends, Christ spoke in the free form of religious, spiritual expression, in the living dialectic style of instruction. As the spirit is exalted above nature, so is the pure, free utterance of the spirit exalted above the symbolic form. But the living spirit in its energy does not break away from nature in order to indulge in abstract thinking, but takes it into its life, transforms it, and causes it to bear witness of its own essence. And thus the Spirit of Christ shows itself in His teachings; they are intermixed with parables and apophthegms. But these parables rise immediately into the light of the great living thoughts by which they are illuminated and sustained. Thus Christ acted towards the children of the spirit.

But He pursued quite a different course with the uninitiated. To such hearers, who were attracted by the power of His personality, or outwardly were for a long time attached to Him, but in whom a disposition of coarse worldliness and an impure interest more or less prevailed, He spoke in parables. Crowds of such men might gather round Him on the sea-shore from among the fishermen and publicans at Capernaum. But, especially at a later period, His adversaries at Jerusalem confronted Him with such dispositions as induced Him to teach in the form of parables.

But on what account the Lord taught in parables before such uninitiated men, we shall learn from the very conception of a parable, as well as from His own distinct explanation. We shall also learn it from the effects which the parables continually produced.

The parable is a figurative form of representation in discourse, which we must distinguish from other forms that have an affinity to it. All figurative forms rest upon the infinite abundance of comparisons which arise from the similarity and relationship of all phenomena, or rather from the unity of the spirit, which establishes all these similarities. All things are reflected in all things, since they are all allied to one another by their relation to the common basis on which they rest, and to the one object which they aim at,

¹ When the adage is correctly apprehended in relation to the thoughtful combination of the sensible and the spiritual, it will be difficult to find in Luke's Sermon on the Mount the Ebionitish, vapid beatitude of the simply temporal poor.

and to the one creative Spirit in whom they live (Rom. xi. 36). But the special mirror of the whole world is man, since the world appears concentrated in him; and the world is the counter-mirror of man, since his spirit's inheritance extends throughout its immensity. Hence all comparisons are crowded into human life as their focus. Hence it comes to pass that man surrounds himself, by means of discourse and art, with images; in this manner he surrounds himself with signs of the ideality of the universe and of his own being. But the comparisons which man forms in his discourse may be exhibited in a well-defined series.

First of all we are met by the similitude of fleeting appearance, or rather accord, that is, Metaphor. It is formed from the endless play of similarities, from the harmonious relations of the harp of the universe. It proceeds from the intimate relationship of the fundamental tones of life; but the most delicate glances and flashes of similarity are sufficient to produce it. Metaphors are the flowers of speech, the butterflies on the field of the spirit. Their number is legion; for as many million times as the heavens are reflected in the sea, all things are reflected in all, and especially in the spirit of man. Further, we meet with similitudes of a related form of life, namely, Allegories. Allegory represents one thing by another, another by another, in a definite, marked formation.¹ But it connects the image and the object not in a purely arbitrary manner, but is conditioned by the similarity of the forms of life. Thus the four horsemen in the apocalyptic vision (vi.) riding on their four horses, one after another, are allegorical figures closely corresponding to the different forms of the course of the world. But if we go beyond the phenomena of life to contemplate the similitudes of the inner man, first of all similitudes of the natural or also of the moral sense come under our notice. They are represented by Fable. Fable is fond especially of representing the reverse side of the ideal, the accidental, the arbitrary and perverted. But how can evil find its like in nature since the substance of all things is good? Evil is certainly in itself null, dark as night, and only like itself. But evil is in the human world in nature-life, and assumes the form of nature-life, and also as disease assumes organic forms and modes in the human organism. By this likeness to nature which evil gains in man, it gains also its similitudes, and these exist most abundantly in the animal creation. In the animal creation very numerous reflections are to be found of human virtues and vices. Hence it is that fable often exhibits unideal human life in idealized animal life, or the animal similarities of man in the human similarities of the animal. When man loses the spirit and becomes like the animal, it is fair that the animal when it represents him should gain his faculty of speech. When Balaam lost the spirit, his ass gained the language of reproof, which represented his overborne conscience. Fable has indeed a wider range than the one we have noticed, but it is its constant peculiarity to exhibit the manifesta-

¹ 'Oratio qua quis ἄλλο μὲν ἀγορεύει, ἄλλο δὲ νοεῖ'—Wilke, *Neu-test. Rhetorik*, p. 103.

tions of the natural disposition of man. It lies in the nature of the case, that it seizes this disposition in its salient points, in its characteristic traits, and exhibits it with a touch of irony and with a moralizing tendency. It therefore frequently aims at improving the distorted side of the spiritual by the light side of the natural. For, as similitude, it aims at the adjustment of the disposition it represents with the whole world besides. But the ideal value is wanting to it, inasmuch as it wants the nature of man, the self-will, the moral obliquity, or even the moral principle. This value announces itself in the similitude of the ideal being, in symbol. The world in its state of rest, or as pure creation, is a system of divine ideas which proceed from the highest idea, the revelation of God in His Son, to branch themselves out and descend into the phenomenal world in definite ideal characteristics of life. On this truth rests the essence of symbol. Every phenomenon, namely, is necessarily a copy and sign of all ideal life which lies upon the same line with it in the direction of the Invisible. When, therefore, such a phenomenon is combined with the ideal being of which it forms an offshoot in the phenomenal world, a symbol is formed.¹ If once a conception of this heavenly ladder has been formed, it will be easy to trace the lines of many phenomena into the Eternal. So a rock in its earthly appearance presents a firm front against the swelling sea, and is an image of firmness against the flood of human instability. In the apostolic rock-man (Peter), and in the Lord, who is a Rock, the ideal essence of it is found again. But the glorification and life's fulness of this firmness appears in another symbolical application of stone, since it proceeds from stone to precious stone, and from this to the heavenly splendour of the mystic precious stones (Rev. xxi.) But the flowing sea is not only found again in the billows of the heathen nations (Ps. xciii. 4; Rev. xiii. 1), but also in the sanctified human life of the world, in the infinitely strong and wave-like sympathy of those who unfold their power only in the spirit of the Christian community (Rev. xix. 6). The dew-drop, the tear of the earth, points upwards to the pearl, the pearl to human tears, and these to the pearls on the gates of the eternal city of God ; glorified sorrow forms the entrance to the residence of eternal joy (Rev. xxi. 21). But in the same way of symbolic we may go from above downwards, when, setting out from the primary ideas of life, we descend and seek out the phenomena in which they are copied. Thus, for example, we can proceed from the four primary forms of the divine life of Christ in the world to the four Evangelists, and from these to the four cherubic life-images. So clearly and powerfully do those ideal primary lines go through the world ; so distinctly does the Divine everywhere resound in significant symbols of the phenomenal world. The grain of wheat, the dove, the vine, and the marriage feast, are symbols of eternal verities in the kingdom of God. But since that Word in which the fulness of God is expressed, became flesh in Christ, so He is necessarily the

¹ From this *συμβάλλειν* proceeds the *σύμβολον*.

symbol of all symbols, and surrounded by a garland of most expressive single symbols in which His own being is reflected. These symbolical relations are revealed by the world in its state of rest. But when contemplated in motion, it appears as the theatre of spiritual facts. These also are represented in figurative forms, and their similitude is the parable. This, therefore, is a form of discourse which represents in a sensible manner an universal, world-historical, religious and spiritual fact, by the exhibition of a special, related, or similar fact.¹ Such are the parables of the Pharisee and publican, of the good Samaritan and other similitudes, which exhibit in single pictures never to be forgotten the greatest and most general religious and ethical facts. But in general the parable is formed in a situation, in which a single figure meets the teacher wherein he beholds that image of the moral world; and it is expressly designed to display to his hearers their whole spiritual position in the world as in a reflected image. The parable is therefore a practical view, by which the teacher causes his hearers to look into their entire spirit-world and its relation to opposite modes of spiritual life; and it may on this account be called a parable, because it suddenly places before the hearer, or circle of hearers, the living image of the world in which he may view himself. The parable constitutes the highest form of figurative similitudes in discourse.

These similitudes, therefore, are seen by us in an ascending line. But here, as everywhere, it is in conformity to an ascending line that the elements of the lower form occur again in the higher, that therefore they are more or less prominent in it. Thus especially the symbolical element in some similitudes of Christ is almost exclusively prominent, and some features of the parable are always allegorical. The message which Christ sent to the Galilean prince Herod, who wanted to frighten Him from his country, is almost in the form of a fable. The fox wished to scare the Lion, and to chase Him from his haunts.

From the nature of the parable, it is evident for what reason the Lord chose this form of teaching for His discourses, which was already familiar to the Hebrew mind, but which in Him attained to perfection. The parable, according to its nature, exhibits truth in a coloured light, which becomes indulgence to the weak, excitement to the sensuous, invigoration for purer eyes—which therefore, in every case, mediates the light of truth according to the varieties of mental vision.

According to an opinion prevalent in modern times, which may be regarded as the modern view of the design of the parable, it seems exclusively to render the truth intelligible to the understandings of a sensuous people. According to this popular theology, parables are only a popular mode of instruction, illustrations which form a sort of picture-gospel for a docile, child-like, and sensuous

¹ The *παραβολή* is formed by the *παραβάλλειν*, the combination of the general spiritual fact which is to be rendered visible to the hearer with a well-defined individual image of it.

people. But our Lord's own statements respecting the design of parables (Matt. xiii. 13, &c.; Mark iv. 11, &c.; Luke viii. 10, &c.) go a long way beyond these paedagogical school views of the subject; even to the length of an awful reference to the judgment of God. According to the Evangelist Matthew, in answer to the disciples' question, 'Why speakest Thou unto them in parables?' He said, 'Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables, because (*ὅτι*) they seeing see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive. For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their hearts, and should be converted, and I should heal them.' Jesus therefore applies the language in which the prophet Isaiah (vi.) had described the obduracy of his contemporaries to the Jewish people of his own time. It was evident to the prophet in a former age, by divine illumination, that his preaching would have the effect of increasing the obduracy of his people; as this is always the effect of preaching if it does not make men better. But he saw at the same time that by this effect the design of his preaching was not frustrated, but that in an awful manner God's design was fulfilled, and that for many persons that would be a judicial decree of God. Such a judicial decree Simeon also found in the advent of Christ (Luke ii. 25), and not less so Christ Himself (John iii. 19). He was aware of the decisive effect of His preaching, and knew that it would become a judgment—a savour of death unto death—through their own criminality. He sought, therefore, in his mercy to diminish as much as possible this danger in the effect of His preaching, by veiling the truth. He announced to the people in parables, which gave to every one an impression of the truth according to the measure of his spiritual and moral power of comprehension, without driving him at once to extremities. Therefore Christ had not the design which the modern view attributes to Him, of imparting the truth to the people by parables in the clearest and plainest form possible.¹ And on the other hand, still less could it be His design to propound parables in order to occupy His hearers with purely unintelligible discourses, or positively to contribute to hardening them. Had such a false predestinarian design influenced Him, the parables could not have had an enlightening effect, they would not have been preserved in the Gospels as a perpetual treasury of knowledge for the Church. According to the words of the Evangelist Mark (iv. 33), Jesus propounded the truth to the people very simply in parables, because it was only so

¹ See Hase, *das Leben Jesu*, p. 144.

they would hear it—that is, not merely apprehend, but apprehend and hear it; for which purpose this was the most suitable form. Hence He might have mentioned this reason simply to His disciples. Or He might have especially put forward the compassion with which He sought, by adopting this form of teaching, to ward off the hardening of the people. But this motive the disciples of themselves could more or less have recognized. On the other hand, they would not be so likely to be sensible of the divine judgment, which lay in the fact, that Jesus was under the necessity of treating the majority of His people as ‘standing without,’ and only by means of parable to instruct them in the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. But this fact especially occupied His thoughts. It was His greatest sorrow that He could not lay open His whole heart to His people—that He was obliged to communicate the message of salvation with a caution similar to what a physician would use in administering a remedy to a person in extreme danger of death. When, therefore, He was obliged to treat the greater part of the Jews, who ought to have been prepared to receive in a devout spirit all the mysteries of the kingdom of God, just like heathens, or even as enemies of the true sanctuary, who were prepared to profane the Most Holy (Matt. vii. 6); when He felt with deepest anguish the awfulness of the divine retribution in this necessity of veiling from their view His divine treasures, and clearly perceived how close at hand was the judgment of the rejection of this people, it was natural that He should exhibit to the disciples this tragical side of His parabolic teaching, which they could not so easily discern. And when He explained to them more fully His motives for adopting this mode of teaching, we can easily conceive that the disciples would preserve in the most lively recollection the judicial divine motive, which He confidentially imparted to them, because it affected them most deeply, and because it was of the greatest service in explaining to them the later judgments that fell upon Israel. Evidently this reference of the Lord to the judgment of God was present to the minds of all the three Evangelists who report this explanation of Jesus. Nevertheless, their accounts seem almost to divide among them the different elements of the Lord's declaration. Matthew's report brings forward most plainly *the design of Christ's condescension* to the capacity of His hearers, His didactic accommodation. In Luke's brief account, *the preventive motive*, the design of repressing what was dangerous in the effect of the word, is most conspicuous (viii. 10): ‘but to others in parables, that seeing they might not see (*īva*), and hearing they might not understand.’ Lastly, Mark in his account sets forth *the judicial sentence of God* in the strongest terms. He has so condensed the declaration of Jesus as it is found in Matthew, that the words with which Jesus explains His parabolic form of teaching, and the word which He adduces in illustration from the prophet Isaiah, exactly coincide. This representation is at all events inexact. But in essential points it does not affect the thoughts of Jesus. For the judicial design of

God must ever have been present to the spirit of Jesus in some form or other, without disparagement to His own compassion ; as indeed in God His judicial determinations are not at variance with His love. Therefore we can only inquire how the awful strictness of God's judicial administration expressed itself in the spirit and parabolic teaching of Jesus? The solution is given in the words by which He marked the Jews as 'them that are without.' He was obliged to veil Himself before them as before strangers or profane persons. This, the spirit of truth required. And though He thus veiled Himself before them with the most vehement sorrow, yet He did it at the same time with the holiest decision, conscious and free. His language on this occasion harmonized with those decisive words (Matt. vii. 23), which, with the declaration of the completed estrangement with which the wicked appear before Him, must also express the completed doom. Those persons who are accustomed to regard the parable merely as an idyllic, agreeable mode of conveying instruction to innocent children, of younger or older growth, must be startled at the awful seriousness of this explanation which Jesus gave respecting His parabolic style of teaching. And we must add, that not only is this painful seriousness shown in the choice of the parables, but also in the circumstance that He propounded them without explaining them to the people, and that it was particularly the doctrine of the kingdom of God which He was led to veil in this manner (Matt. xiii. 11).¹ And the doctrine of the kingdom of God was exactly that in which Jesus differed most widely from the views of His nation. On that point He could not but disappoint their expectations. He therefore was obliged to use the greatest caution in His communications to the people on this subject. His crucifixion is a proof that He had not gone too far in His caution ; and the destruction of Jerusalem proves that the people were no longer capable of receiving instruction respecting the true nature of the kingdom of God.

We can explain the design of the Gospel parables by the effects which they produce in history. They serve to bring the highest and most glorious mysteries of the kingdom of God as near as possible to the sensually-enthralled human race—to represent in pleasant, attractive enigmas, forms of character never to be forgotten, and yet to guard them as much as possible from the profanation which would bring destruction on profane spirits. They operate, therefore, on a small scale, exactly as the world from which they are taken does on a larger. The whole world in its state of repose is to be regarded as a symbol, but in its state of motion as a parable of the divine essence. And as the Gospel parables have in reference to individuals a twofold operation, so also has the world on mankind collectively. It serves to conceal the essence of God from all impure eyes ; and this concealment has its gradations continually increasing, so that the most impure eyes and the most profane dispositions lose God behind the world or in it, and sink

¹ See Hoffmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, Part ii. p. 98.

down into Atheism. But this same world serves to unveil God to the gaze of the devout, so that they see the traces of His omnipresence shining forth with ever increasing lustre; and hereafter their purified hearts shall behold Him in perfection as all in all. Both operations of the world are great, extending over all ages, and designed by God. And yet they are not the effect of a double meaning belonging to the world, but rather proceed from its complete, pure simplicity. The eternal heavenly harmony of the world, ever like itself, is the cause of its producing an effect on every man in conformity to his own character. Thus it was with the parables of Christ—those special world-pictures which were destined to represent special spiritual facts relating to the kingdom of God.

From this mediation results the mode in which Jesus accommodated Himself to the people. The rationalist theory of accommodation—namely, the hypothesis that Jesus, in order to gain the people, countenanced their erroneous notions—is shown by the majesty of His truthfulness and by the fact of His crucifixion to be a worthless and degrading view. That theory savours of Jesuitism and a dread of the Cross, and therefore of selfish considerations, to which Jesus was a stranger.¹ But, on the other hand, if by the accommodation attributed to Him is understood that perfect wisdom in teaching with which He let Himself down to the popular mind, it is evident that, exactly in this paedagogical accommodation, His skill as a teacher, or, we may say, His special incarnation in the art of teaching, is exhibited. Here it is proper to remark, that Jesus could not feel Himself obliged to correct the popular notions which did not belong to the sphere of revelation, but merely related to unessential historical matters. It would even contradict the organic completeness of His ministry and teaching, if He had taught details that were extraneous to the connection of His work and the exigencies of His position—if, for example, He had been disposed to make disclosures respecting the world of spirits. So He complied with the more or less arbitrary, conventional assumptions and designations which belonged to the popular language, and without which He could not have discoursed intelligibly. But His inclination to substitute more significant terms for such as were conventional proved that He tested the most social types of tradition in His eternal spirit; and, with such an ever fresh consciousness of His truthfulness, it cannot be admitted that He allowed base coins to go through His hands, or false assumptions through His lips.

Discourse in parables served first of all to exhibit the eternal in the temporal, and this was for a long time the predominant effect of it. But the more the nature of parables is thoroughly understood, the more will the impression be removed, that we have in them to do with arbitrary comparisons of things essentially different; we shall evermore recognize the essential relation between the similitude and its ideal world. But when the parable in general is

¹ Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 119.

viewed in this light, according to the sentence of the poet, ‘ everything transitory is only a similitude,’ particular parables then also serve to glorify the temporal in the eternal, as before they glorified the eternal in the temporal. So, for example, in the picture of the woman who searched for the lost piece of money; we see the divine valuation of the valuable, how it goes in anxious quest of it through all the world. In the hand of this careful housekeeper we shall see a ray of that sun beaming forth which seeks the lost. In the conduct of the faithful shepherd, who seeks for the lost sheep in the wilderness, and hazards his own life to recover it, we shall recognize the divine foolishness of that love which sacrificed the most glorious life in order to rescue sinners ; which therefore does not calculate, and is not rational according to the notions of the earthly world, but whose irrationality is nothing else than the sublimity of the highest reason, which always goes hand in hand with love. Thus therefore the main features of the ideality of the world appear in the parables as it has its principle in Christ, and is to become manifest by the operation of His Spirit ; or the first clearest signs of the parabolic character of the world, the primitive forms of the great world-parable in which God unfolds the riches of His Spirit and life.¹

It lies in the nature of a parable that it can be contracted or enlarged, and that it is sufficiently flexible to allow sometimes one side and sometimes another to be prominent. So we find again in the Gospels several parables with various modifications.² But these modifications cannot be regarded as fresh constructions of the same parable without displacing the proper point of view for judging of the parable. For in its formation we have to do, not with a beautiful, elaborated fiction, but with a life-image of the truth. When, therefore, a parable of Jesus corresponds to this object in its first draught, its later enlargement cannot be considered as a completion of it, but only as a modification which is designed to exhibit the truth pointed out in a new relation, in a fresh light. As little can it be admitted that tradition has remodelled the parables. They were impressed too powerfully in the remembrance of the apostolic Church as organic totalities for that to be possible. Yet we may conclude from the free individuality of the Gospels, that each Evangelist, according to the whole spirit of his conception, might allow some integral parts of a parable to retire, and place others more prominently in the foreground.³

¹ The Evangelist Matthew appears to have indicated this side of the parable very thoughtfully in the remark in which he applies the words of Asaph (Ps. lxxviii. 2), in a free citation, to the parables of Christ; namely, with the words, ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, ‘ I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world’ (Matt. xiii. 35).

² So, for instance, the parables, Mark iv. 2, compared with iv. 26 ; Luke xiv. 15, compared with Matt. xxii. 1-14.

³ Thus Luke, in the parable of the marriage supper (xiv. 15), according to the connection in which he introduces it, and his own kindly predisposition, gives peculiar prominence to the compassion of the Lord (ver. 21) ; and, on the other hand, withdraws the element of judgment which is forcibly presented by Matthew (xxii. 7). Luke also omits the second instance of judgment in Matt. xxii. 13. Matthew, on the

The relationship of the parabolic form of teaching to unfigurative, didactic discourse appears in the parabolic discourses. We must not confound these with the parables properly so called. They are characterized by having the parabolic element mingled with the explanation in the flow of a continued discourse. The parable is therefore not given in its pure, exclusive form, detached from other matter; but its essential elements, its single images, form the leading thoughts of the discourse. This form of discourse embraces all single forms of imagery in living unity: flashing metaphors, ornate allegories, touches of fable, magnificent symbols, and parabolic figures form the splendour of the beautiful banks through which flows the deep thought-stream of parabolic discourse, and are reflected in its depths with all their colours and forms. And so this form is a copy of the great combination between the images of the divine in the world and the world-transforming thoughts of the Spirit of God.

If we now look back and compare the parables of Jesus with His miracles, they will appear to us like those, as forms of the communication of His divine fulness to the poverty of the world, as mediating forms. But they are related to one another, not only according to their destiny, but according to their nature. The miracles of Jesus are visibly great single similitudes of His universal agency—similitudes in facts. His similitudes, on the other hand, disclose themselves as miracles of His word, when we recognize in them the ideal relation of essence between the eternal and the temporal. The miracle is a fact which comes from the word, and becomes the word. The similitude is a word which comes from the fact, and impresses itself in the fact. The common birthplace of these ideal twin-forms is therefore the world-creative and world-transforming Word. At the close of this examination we had to give a distinct representation of the parables according to their living connection. But the doctrine of the kingdom of God, which Christ announced and founded, forms this connection; and since we have to discuss this doctrine in the next section, we shall form the most correct estimate of the parables, if we contemplate them under the point of view just named, in their organic connection as similitudes relating to the founding of the kingdom of God.

NOTES.

1. Neander also has treated of the parables separately, with a reference to the thought that forms their basis, the founding of the kingdom of God.

2. Since art has to do with the ideal contemplation and representation of life, so imagery, as the reflex of the ideal in discourse,

contrary, gives less prominence to the element of compassion, since he introduces the parable in a connection in which the idea of the future judgment predominates. But we have here to do with modifications formed by Jesus Himself, so that only the selection of the precise parables can be referred to the individuality of the Evangelists.

must be related to art. But in this relation metaphor reminds us of music, allegory of painting and the plastic art, fable of the drama (which by the ancients was also distinguished as fable), symbol of lyric poetry, and, lastly, parable of epic poetry and tales. Music is the image simply ; it elicits from objective life the spiritual music of its infinitely powerful relationship to the heart. The plastic arts allegorize throughout ; they exhibit ideal appearances in which homogeneous appearances in life are reflected. The drama is not only related to fable in this respect, that it causes the characters it exhibits to operate and exhibit themselves by speech, but also in this, that it allows their reciprocal action in general to come forth from the noble or ignoble nature-side of their life not yet elevated into the spirit. In lyric poetry, on the other hand, the meditating spirit always exhibits symbolically an ideal image of the world and of human dispositions ; the lyrical element rises above the complexity of the drama. Epic poetry and tales, lastly, exhibit spiritual life-images in their practical movements like the parable. But the two lines of representation are distinguished in this respect, that the didactic images serve the practical object of discourse, while the artistical images represent life in a state of rest and enjoyment.

SECTION XI.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

As we have already remarked, it is an absolutely false assumption, that Christ entirely rejected the Jewish expectations of the reign of the Messiah ; or at least that He designed to establish a merely spiritual kingdom. In contrast to this notion, we must point to the fact that the spirit of the Gospels throughout favours the promise which was given to Mary, that the Messiah should rule for ever as a king on the throne of David (Luke i. 32, 33), and similar expectations (i. 69). The announcement with which John opened his ministry, that the kingdom of heaven was at hand (Matt. iii. 2), was immediately repeated by Jesus (Matt. iv. 17).¹ And we cannot overlook the circumstance, that all the disciples of Jesus entered into His communion on the distinct understanding that He was about to found a kingdom (Matt. xviii. 1).

But had Christ really purposed to found only a spiritual kingdom—in other words, not a kingdom, but a school—He could hardly with truthfulness have induced the men who came to Him with that expectation to join themselves to Him. Still less could He have yielded His assent to their supposition, as He really did (Matt. xix. 28).² Rather, He was conscious of being in the strictest sense the

¹ Glosses have been made, without reason, on this repetition of the words of the Baptist in the lips of Jesus. The Evangelist reports the announcements of both, not in their original extent, but in a condensed form, as is his wont. Moreover, these two great preachers of the kingdom were no rhetoricians, who might have made it their business to describe the one great fact which they announced in embellished variations.

² It is very important that Christ calls the revelation of His kingdom *The Regne-*

King of humanity, and of founding a kingdom, that is, a realm of God, to come hereafter into actual appearance, and completing itself in a visible community. Only in relation to the founding, the spirit, and the nature of this kingdom, He was obliged to hold Himself aloof from the expectation of the Jews. But it is indeed a false notion to imagine that all the Jews cherished a fully developed, carnalized, equally rude and low expectation of this kingdom. The expectation was originally a religious one, and therefore more spiritual or carnal according as the persons who cherished it had a higher or lower stand-point. Probably it was as multiform as in Christendom the idea of the nature of the Church. There could be no devout man in Israel who did not possess, in the Jewish shell of his idea of the kingdom, a christological kernel. Only thus was it possible for the Lord to engage the disciples as heralds of His kingdom (Matt. x. 7). He needed not to annihilate their expectation, but only to purify and transform it by the fire of regeneration. In this process of purification all were obliged to go through a great fire, and a Judas through his own criminality became dross; all the rest incurred the greatest risk. But they bore uninjured the certainty that Christ founded the kingdom, though fully purified by the flames. After the resurrection (Acts i. 6) and ascension (Acts iii. 20, 21) of the Lord, the confidence of the disciples bloomed afresh, that He would establish His eternal kingdom by their means; it was imperishable. Nevertheless the doctrine of Christ concerning His kingdom, differed, as we have said, so far from the prevalent conceptions of His people, that He saw Himself obliged to bring it near to them under the veil of parables. We can plainly distinguish a threefold cyclus of such parables. The first exhibits the kingdom of God in general, in its development. In the second and third, the essential forms of activity by which God completes His kingdom are pointed out. The second cyclus, namely, includes the parables respecting the mercy which founds and fills up the kingdom of God; the third contains the parables of the judgment, by means of which it is completed in its purity.

Jesus delivered the parables respecting the kingdom of God in general, for the most part, to the multitudes on the shores of the Galilean sea; not all at once, but on different occasions.¹

The first of these parables describes the sower scattering his seed on land consisting of very different kinds of soil, and of which the crop is regulated by the quality of the soil on which the seed is cast (Matt. xiii. 1-23; Mark iv. 1-20; Luke viii. 4-15). The general groundwork of the parable is the truth, that the culture of heaven is reflected in the culture of earth. God's corn-field, mankind, is reflected as to its chief relations in the corn-field of mankind, the earth. The sower who makes his appearance in this parable is not some petty husbandman who cultivates a small en-

ration (*παλιγγενεσία*); indicating that it must be founded wholly and entirely on regeneration.

¹ Compare Mark iv. 10; Matt. xiii. 10, ver. 36.

closed piece of ground ; his field is large, of various quality—an image of the earth, or rather of humanity. So we see that humanity is as distinctly and comprehensively cultivated by its sower, as the earth by man. ‘The word of the kingdom’ is everywhere expressed in its most general form. This is the first leading thought : the whole of humanity is God’s corn-field. But the second thought shows how God treats mankind justly and equally in the distribution of His seed. The seed of the word falls everywhere ; the same seed falls on the stony ground and on the wayside that falls on the good ground. But the soil is very different. Even in a smaller piece of ground the difference exists. Besides the good ground, there are corners of the field trodden down—places where there is a want of soil above the rock, and places where there is a rank growth of thorns. On these differences the produce of the sowing depends. Only on the good ground does the seed thrive for the harvest. These relations are exhibited more fully on a large scale. Many cultivated tracts of the earth are trodden down, spoilt, gone wild ; and there are in proportion only a few choice districts and cultivated grounds. And so it is in humanity, both on the great and small scale. In this lies the third leading thought of the parable. On the largest scale we see the different soils in the different religions. In Heathendom we see the trodden wayside : the seed of God which falls on this ground is immediately—since the heathen do not understand it ($\muὴ συνιέντος$)—taken away by the fowls of heaven, by the wicked one. Corrupted Judaism exhibits the stony ground : here the seed sprang up quickly, but withered under the sun of tribulation, under the rays of the Cross. The ground where the good seed is choked by the thorns of worldly lusts, is the Mohammedan world. The good ground is Christendom. But even within the pale of Christendom there are again the same varieties of susceptibility ; hearts which have been hardened by the repeated tread of evil, so that the seed of the word not received only rests on it outwardly, and is taken away by the first temptation of the evil one ;—superficial souls, who received the word with a sudden enthusiasm, but remain unchanged in their radical disposition, and therefore easily fall away ;—souls which are deeply involved in the cares and pleasures of the world, and therefore cannot surrender themselves to the highest. On these soils the seed thrives not. But yet the husbandman gains a clear profit from his sowing, a joyful harvest. The earth yields its increase, and so does humanity. God obtains His harvest from the good ground in humanity. The plan of the parable might easily have led to conceive of these differences of susceptibility in a fatalist sense. But this is not the Lord’s design. First of all, He obviates such a misinterpretation by changing men of different soils into men of different fallings of the seed. He speaks of that which is sown on the wayside, instead of the wayside on which it is sown ; of that which is sown on the stony ground ; and so on. According to this construction, men are the seed in various states ;

there is a life in them, and a human life according to the kind of men. Then it is said of the man of the good ground, ‘This is he that heareth the word and understandeth it;’ the activity of his spirit is rendered prominent. And when it is said, in conclusion, that the good ground bore thirty, sixty, or a hundred-fold, not merely the difference of the natural capacity, but likewise the free appropriation and application of the word is pointed out. In the definiteness of these numbers are represented the definiteness and harmony of the blessings, the living powers, of the kingdom of God. Thus God obtains His world-historical harvest in humanity on the good ground of chosen and faithful hearts. He therefore conquers the negative hindrances to His kingdom, those of the manifold defective and blunted human susceptibility.

But His kingdom has also positive hindrances to overcome. This is shown by the parable of the tares among the wheat (Matt. xiii. 24-30, 36-43). The general symbolic of this parable consists in the delineation of the positive tendency to degeneracy and running wild which is shown in the life of the earth, and presents hindrances to its culture; and just so in the life of humanity. As in the ground, the noxious plants threaten to choke the noble cultivated plants; so in the life of humanity, the seed of corruption threatens the seed of salvation. Three leading thoughts proceed from this truth. This is first evident: the heavenly sower is opposed by a dark sower, his enemy; a noxious seed is placed in opposition to the good seed and threatens to choke it. Thus, therefore, not merely human weakness, unsusceptibility, and culpable defect are opposed to the kingdom of God, as in the first parable, but a kingdom of conscious wickedness whose point of unity is Satan, as the enemy of Christ, as the life-principle of all antichristianity. His sowing time is the night, when people are asleep. Under the protection of human weakness, the work of devilish wickedness flourishes. The seed which the enemy sows in the consecrated field, in which the wheat has already been sown, is darnel, a weed resembling wheat, but a positive weed, since it grows up between the wheat and endangers it. ‘The good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the bad seed are the children of the wicked one.’ Not men as men form the contrast, for Satan is no Ahriman who can form men, but men as they are become identical with the *spiritual seed* received into their inmost being. The wicked, therefore, are here described as the weeds as far as they are identical with the ‘offences’ (*τὰ σκάνδαλα*, Matt. xiii. 41) which check the growth of Christ’s good seed. Evidently these offences are the religious and moral heresies in the Church. They have in common a life-germ of demoniac origin, and an antichristian bias. They are collectively and separately the wheat-like darnel. The element of truth which in them is decomposed into falsehood, the form of doctrine which they assume, and the enthusiasm with which they are carried away—all this makes them have the semblance of the wheat of pure doctrine, and of the Christian life that is the product of that doctrine. But

this darnel owes all its vital power to the fact, that men identify themselves with it until they exhibit it themselves, and therefore realize the antinomian principle (*ἀνόμια*) which lies in heresy. The greatest danger in the appearance of the darnel arises from its not springing up merely in one patch of ground, but growing through the whole corn-field, scattered in every part. In this manner it apparently threatens to destroy the whole crop, and this it is which so alarms the servants of the proprietor. Then we are introduced to the second leading thought of the parable. The servants wish to pull up the noxious plants; but their master orders them to let them grow with the wheat till harvest. The excitement of the servants proceeds first of all from their anger at the wickedness of the enemy: they wish to punish him by destroying his crop; and next, their zeal is roused for the cleanly state of the field, that it may be throughout free from blemish. Lastly, their fears are excited lest the darnel should choke the wheat, or even adhere to it and change it into darnel. But the master is superior to their excitement, for he sees that these zealous servants would be as dangerous to his crop of wheat as the enemy. In their passionate zeal they are not in a state to distinguish stalk for stalk between darnel and wheat, particularly as in the green shoots they are so much alike, the less they are developed. There is therefore great danger of their doing great damage to the crop of wheat in their attempt to weed it. But their master knew of a certainty that the wheat would remain wheat, and in time overtop the darnel; and the nearer the harvest approached, the more distinctly it would contrast with it, so that at last the wheat would be most easily separated from the darnel. In this feature of the parable the great thoughts of the Lord respecting His kingdom are contained. The servants of the sower have in history proved it a thousand times by the fact, that the darnel and the wheat cannot be distinguished with sufficient exactness. How often have the purest doctrines been execrated as noxious weeds; how often have the children of the kingdom been condemned as darnel and committed to the flames! In such cases the servants have assisted the enemy himself: their hatred of men has been kindled by his; his unbelief has inflamed the unbelief in them which imagined that the seed of Christ could be destroyed; they had lost the repose of spirit and the clearness of vision which beheld the glory and righteousness of their Lord. These zealots in the wheat-field commit violence, contrary to the express commands of their Lord. He knows that the false heart will always form false doctrine, and false doctrine will always find a congenial soil in false hearts, which assimilate themselves to it, and thus the noxious plant must complete its history. It must ripen till harvest,—then the entire worthlessness and noxiousness of its seed will be discovered. How otherwise could it be perfectly judged at the last judgment? But to the Lord it is equally certain that pure doctrine will always find true hearts; that it will be ever retained and flourish in congenial dispositions till the day of

harvest, when the whole crop will be ripened in the life of the children of the kingdom. The precious seed and its precious operations, and the precious souls,—that is, the precious seed of Christ in the Gospel, the precious seed of the Spirit in the Church, and the precious seed of the Father in the creation,—will ever meet together and form a wheat-field, which, though outwardly intermixed with darnel, yet remains true to its destiny, and will certainly reach it. There is one more consideration which the parable could less definitely express. That seed of light and the opposite seed of darkness both find a susceptible soil in humanity. But it does not follow that some hearts have originally only a disposition for the darnel and others for the wheat. In this relation the most numerous intermixtures, fluctuations, and transitions take place, and it is not well to pass a final judgment during this stormy season of development. Even erroneous doctrine and the truth itself, during this intervening period, are found in such an intermixture, not in themselves, but in the heads and opinions of men, that even in doctrine the wheat and the noxious plants cannot be perfectly and in all their parts separated from each other till the end. The harvest-time is here that terminus where heresies have set themselves as completed scandals, as principles of destruction against the truths of the Gospel, the principles of salvation, and where men who advocate the contrary to these principles have at length become identified with them, so that judgment must follow. From this significance of the final judgment, we may understand in what sense Christ has required His servants to tolerate the darnel-crop during the present life. In the law of the Old Testament theocracy the punishment of death was inflicted on false prophets. Religious zeal might erroneously transplant this law and apply it in a manner most detrimental to the very essence of this economy, by concentrating all the elements of this theocratic typical process against the false prophets. This took place when such zeal placed on an equal footing mistaken opinion with erroneous teaching, and erroneous teaching with fixed heretical dogma, and this with actual social outrage, and outrage with a capital offence, and this with the offending soul ; and, accordingly, at one stroke instructed, refuted, excommunicated, tried, condemned, and everlastinglly damned the real or supposed heretic. In this way, forsooth, has the Old Testament typical law been expounded and practically enforced by the hierarchy of the Christian Church. In opposition to the horrible judicial arrogance of such servants, whose minds have been darkened by the fear of the devil and the hatred of men, the Lord requires the toleration of the darnel in His wheat-field. But this toleration cannot signify an absolute impunity to evil ; but only a holy keeping apart of the *momenta* we have mentioned. The passing error should only be corrected, for it is sufficiently ripe for that (Jas. v. 19). Distinct erroneous doctrine should be refuted, and its teachers punished by admonition ; for this purpose are the angels of the Church there (1 Tim. iv. 1-6). Fixed

antichristian dogma must be excluded from the Church, with its promulgators, for it has become a scandal to the consciousness of the Church (Gal. i. 9). The offender against the laws of social order must be judged (Rom. xiii. 4), and he who is chargeable with a capital crime must atone for it with his life (Matt. xxvi. 52). But no one must be condemned and rooted out of the Church as a noxious plant; for only at the last judgment can this judgment be passed by holy beings, by the impartial angels, and the judgment of Christ Himself. Thus Christ wills toleration as an infinite energy of patience, which must come forth for ever new in His congregation, from the purest reciprocal action between the spirit of righteousness and the spirit of mercy; and with this, the last principle of this parable is announced. There is coming such a complete separation of all impure and pure elements, of all that is Christian and antichristian in humanity, as certainly as harvest-time follows seed-time; and that harvest-time comes as a sudden great epoch at the completion of the development of the seed. Then will men be treated in judgment like the principles with which they have identified themselves. This identification on the part of the good is a complete one, for a man can become altogether one with the light; but with darkness he cannot altogether become one, for identification with evil, in which evil men become individual scandals, is an incomplete, a crying contradiction, an internal laceration, and fiery torment, which in itself is a judgment, and to which, as an outward judgment, the fire of hellish relations corresponds, into which the wicked will be thrown, and in which they will burn. That the noxious plants are gathered into bundles before they are burnt, points to the bringing together of the bad by their separation from the good, as it forms one part of their judgment. But the good form a wheat-harvest, in which all will become living bread for all, a world of ideality, in which all will be upheld and borne by all in the eternal brightness of life—the pure produce of the development of humanity. One great fact of the kingdom of God is here depicted, when it is said, that after the separation of the darnel from the wheat, the righteous shall shine forth as the sun. The release of the pure Church from the pressure which, by the mixture of its members with the antagonist members, weighs down their souls, must have the effect of giving them an infinitely powerful and delightful elevation. The Lord adds to this promise the words which always arouse the attention to an important communication, ‘Whoso hath ears to hear, let him hear.’

The third parable (Mark iv. 26–29), represents in a very striking manner the gradual development of the kingdom of God in time. This kingdom is bound to a rhythm, the succession in time of the development of nature. No sooner is the seed sown, than the growth proceeds of itself agreeably to nature, without incessant toil and anxiety on the part of the husbandman. He cannot bring on the harvest before its appointed time; he must quietly wait, and so it certainly comes to him. But it comes when the seed has gone

through all its forms of existence, till it appears in the last stage of ripened corn. First the green blade shoots forth, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear, and last of all the ripe grain. This beautiful parable shows that the kingdom of God, not only in its widest extent, but in the individual soul, requires time and patience for its development, and that the seed of God grows quietly and surely, day and night, wherever it is in the right soil. At the same time the important thought is presented, that we ought rightly to estimate all the forms of development in the kingdom of God—the green field of hope in its youthfulness, as well as the time when the Gothic spires rise towards heaven as do the high-pointed, but not yet full ears; and the time when the stalks become heavier, and the heads droop, as the time of harvest, when all is shining in the golden light of joy.

After the development of the kingdom of God in time, its development in space, its spread in the world, is depicted in the parable of the grain of mustard-seed (Matt. xiii. 31, 32; Mark iv. 30-32; Luke xiii. 18, 19). The kingdom of God in its beginning is the smallest of all seeds; but in its unfolding it is the greatest of herbs, a real tree, so that the birds of heaven come and make their nests in its branches. In its beginning, therefore, it is remarkably small; in its development, remarkably large—its extension in space is wonderful. And thus the kingdom of God has actually been extended. The earthly appearance of Jesus was the wonderful small grain of mustard-seed; but the plant which sprang from this germ is ever spreading itself throughout the whole world. The same thing is true of the seed of the kingdom of God in the breast of the individual: a single word of God, which lies, as it were, buried in the depths of the soul, spreads itself by degrees as a tree of life through his whole inward and outward life.

This certainty and power of expansion belonging to the kingdom of God indicates also a preponderance of power by which it overcomes all earthly opposition. This specific preponderance of the life of Christ over the whole natural life of the world, is expressed in the parable of the leaven (Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 20, 21). The leaven is simply and invariably a match for the dough. Let only a small quantity of it be mixed in three measures of meal, and as it were buried deep in it, yet it will penetrate and leaven the whole heap, and change its nature into its own nature. With the same certainty Christianity gains the mastery over the natural life of humanity, as it is buried both in the nature-fulness of the world and in the nature of a single individual whose inner man is affected by it. This perfectly certain, victorious power of the Christian principle is here depicted; not merely its imperceptible, quiet, gradual operation, though this quiet, imperceptible delicacy of its action is contained in the parable. But at the same time the parable declares the circumstance, that Christianity with this preponderance must christianize humanity. As, on the one hand, the leaven is different from the dough, so is Christianity from the natural life of

men. Therefore it cannot allow this life to retain its old character. And as, on the other hand, the leaven bears an intimate relation to the dough, so does Christianity to the essential life of man, and therefore can and must mingle with it. But that is a higher potency of the dough. On the certainty of this fact rests the confidence of the woman who kneads the leaven into the meal ; she knows that owing to its superior power it must transform the dough into its own nature. In like manner Christianity is a higher potency of humanity, and on that rests the confidence of the Church, which, with its weak hand, performs the same office in spiritual things as the woman in earthly things, when it infuses the life-power of Christ into the blood and life of humanity.¹

But this preponderance of the Church is no natural necessity for individuals in the world, so that they would become Christians without knowing how. They may be outwardly christianized by that leavening influence of Christianity without becoming Christians in their individual inward life. For individuals in the world, Christianity remains continually a mysterious, hidden treasure. At the best, they are aware of its existence as a hidden, far-distant treasure, celebrated by report. Whoever finds it may esteem himself fortunate in the highest degree ; for in this discovery God's highest freedom co-operates with the highest free agency of man. When a man has found this treasure, he recognizes it as the highest good of his life ; he gives up everything in order to gain the divine good of individual, vital Christianity. Thus the world-historical Christianity becomes individual. These relations are pointed out by the treasure hid in the field (Matt. xiii. 44) and by the pearl of great price (ver. 45). The two parables resemble one another in this point, that they show how Christianity must be first found by the individual ; how it becomes his portion in concentrated unity as the highest good of life, and desired as an absolute, new, and heavenly life-treasure, so that the man is ready with joy to resign his ancient life-treasure, in whatever imaginary good it might consist, and at the same time his own self-will, with which he clung to that treasure. This surrender is represented under the image of purchase-money, in part allegorically, and in part symbolically. It is only allegory when it is said that man gains the pearl of great price by the surrender of his earthly comforts ; for this surrender cannot be considered as the payment of the purchase-money, but only as the removal of obstacles, as the fulfilment of conditions : yet the description is, in its internal sense, symbolical ; when man surrenders himself and his old life-image to God in faith, he gains, in the vital exchange of love, a participation of the life of God. He gains Christ, the treasure hid in the field, the pearl of great price ; and if he possesses the most precious pearl in its unity, he no longer

¹ Olshausen believes that the reference of the three measures of meal to the sanctification of the three powers (*Potenzen*) of human nature by means of Christianity, is not to be unceremoniously rejected. But then we must also bring in the three powers which Christianity spiritualizes in its totality ; and as such we may regard the Church, the State, and the cosmical Globe.

seeks the inferior pearls in their multiplicity, which, compared with that pearl, are valueless. But though no one receives the treasure of Christianity otherwise than on the condition of a pure surrender, yet there is a great difference in the way and manner by which individuals obtain it. In one case the superintendence of grace which makes a man the happy finder is conspicuous in all its nobleness. Most suddenly he lights upon the treasure in the field, and from a poor day-labourer becomes a wealthy man.¹ In the other case his discovery is the final result of a long, conscious striving. He was a merchant whose attention was directed to precious pearls, and who gladly laid out his property on the choicest goods of life; who perhaps sought his satisfaction in the pleasure resulting from high morality, the cultivation of the fine arts, of literature, and of science. He was seeking for goodly pearls; he finds the one pearl of great price. This merchant is also a finder to whom the highest blessing of Heaven, grace, is propitious. But his long seeking, the mediation of finding by a higher striving, is made more conspicuous. On the other hand, the favour of Heaven came suddenly on the first finder, although he was unconsciously a seeker, a man who was digging the field for the sake of bread. As the free saving agency of the grace of God in the reconciliation of man is set forth in the parable of the treasure hid in the field, so is the noblest striving of man in it by the parable of the pearl of great price.²

The last parable in this cyclus is that of the net cast into the sea, and enclosing all kinds of fish (Matt. xiii. 47-50). When full, it is drawn on shore. The fishermen sit down and gather the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. The explanation of this parable shows, that the judgment is represented under a new point of view. The judgment had already been spoken of in the parable of the darnel and the wheat; but the leading thought of that parable was the necessity of tolerating heretical spirits, and the judgment itself appeared principally as a separation of offences and their perpetrators. But here the distinction between the good and the bad, the elect of humanity and its refuse, is represented unconditionally in the contrast of the good and the bad fish. The net is the Church in its widest extent, as the institution which, in its consummated operation at the end of the world (*ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰώνος*), embraces the whole world, and has continually embraced it according to its ideal significance as the glory of Christ's kingdom. The judgment here appears from the point of view which regards the correct estimate of the essential worth of individuals. The righteous form collectively an essential heaven; the wicked, an

¹ The contrivance which this man employed to make the field his own, must, as Olshausen justly remarks, be explained on the same principle as the parable of the unjust steward.—[See Trench, *Notes on the Parables*, p. 126.—Tr.]

² To the same class, according to Neander, belong the passages in Luke xiv. 28 and 31, about the man who built a tower and counted the cost, and the king who was about to make war and consulted respecting his forces; but these passages rather belong to parabolic discourses, since the comparisons are only incidentally made.—[Neander, *Life of Christ*, § 203, p. 342.—Tr.]

essential hell ; and the separation is made accordingly. Here also the judgment of the wicked is marked by their being cast into the fire where is wailing and gnashing of teeth.¹

All the parables in this cycle show to what extent Christ deviated from the Jewish representations of the Messianic kingdom, and combated them. According to the Jewish preconception, the heavenly sower had cultivated and sown only a small field in the wilderness of the world, the people of Israel, who bore the best fruits in the fidelity of their observances. This corn-field, according to the false notion of the Jews, was pure enough ; but all round there grew a crop of noxious plants, the heathen world. At the most, there appeared in those opposed to the one Jewish sect but one kind of noxious plants ; but when this appeared distinctly in the shape of individual opinion, they inflicted stoning in order to exterminate it. Neither the metamorphoses of the kingdom of God as depicted in the third parable, nor its extension, as in the fourth, suited their system. The doctrine of the vital operation of the kingdom of heaven as portrayed in the parable of the leaven, agreed not with their system of traditions ; still less could they admit, in their self-righteousness, that each one among them must enter the kingdom of heaven through a special act of grace in his individual experience. The judgment, they imagined, would consist in the exaltation of the Jews and the punishment of the Gentiles ; this momentous separation was, in their opinion, completed long before outwardly. Thus, in one word, the whole difference was decidedly exhibited between the completely pure original Christianity and totally decayed Judaism in all these doctrines of the kingdom. It was only in parables that the people could endure such severe Christian truths.

By means of the three last parables of the first cycle, the two following cycles are already announced. If here, in the parables relating to the agency of mercy, the traits of judicial righteousness come forth at first gently, but afterwards more powerfully ; and if again, in the parables relating to judgment, the traits of redeeming grace and love are constantly to be found, we are not to be surprised. For these fundamental forms of the divine administration are not antagonistic to one another. Rather we may affirm, that one is a necessary complement of the other, and that they build up the divine kingdom in living co-operation. This twofold aspect

¹ The fiery furnace into which at the revelation of the new æon the ungodly will be thrown, is a counterpart of the fiery furnace into which, while the old æon flourished, the godly were thrown (Dan. iii.) In that furnace 'the song of the three men in the fire' resounded as a great song of praise ; in the other furnace will be heard the howl of anguish and pain, and the teeth-gnashing of wrath and wickedness (see Rev. ix. 2). By the fiery trial of the pious, heaven was rendered visible in humanity ; the fiery heat which the wicked endure, brings to light the inward hell in humanity. So also the outer darkness in which there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth (Matt. viii. 12, xxii. 13), is thus pointed out in contrast to the holy darkness in which God dwells (Exod. xx. 21 ; 1 Kings viii. 12), among the praises of Israel (Ps. xxii. 3), and the darkness of the tribulation of the pious, which, by the blessing of their inward peace, shall be as clear as noonday (Isa. lviii. 10). These contrasts plainly indicate that it is the wicked who make hell, hell.

of the parables we are about to consider, may in some instances make it doubtful whether we are to place them in the second or in the third group ; in such cases, we must pay particular attention to the leading thought of the parable.

It accords with Luke's peculiar predilection, that he has collected most of the parables that illustrate the administration of mercy. These parables the Lord was especially induced to bring forward, when, towards the close of His ministry, He came into frequent collision with the Pharisees, and had to censure their unloving disposition.

The first of these parables is a noble portraiture of mercy, which very properly opens this cycle ; namely, the parable of the good Samaritan (Luke x. 30-37). By means of this parable, Jesus explained to the scribe, who wished to tempt Him, who was his neighbour. The man who, according to our Lord's representation, falls among thieves between Jerusalem and Jericho, is a Jew from the metropolis. His neighbours in the Jewish sense are the priest and the Levite, who heartlessly hurry by him as he lies half-dead. The Samaritan who travels the same way is, according to the Jewish prejudice, not his neighbour, and he dare not promise himself any help from him. But generous pity moves his breast as he sees the Jew lying there half-dead. The latter must be glad, that in such a plight a Samaritan salutes him, lifts him up, binds his wounds, and pours in oil and wine. He readily consents to be placed on the beast of the reputed unclean stranger, and to be taken by him to the inn. He must acknowledge such a deliverer to be his neighbour, and, ashamed and overcome by his noble-mindedness, must also become the neighbour of his deliverer. With wonderful skill Christ has so put the case, that no choice is left to the scribe, but he must himself condemn his Jewish prejudice. No feature of the parable is impossible. An orthodox Jew from Jerusalem might fall among thieves. There are priests and Levites who would be heartless enough to pass by him without sympathy ; it is very possible that a Samaritan might pity and help him. And such traits of character are frequently to be found in real life. But the reality is always a judgment on that hatred of heretics which eradicates universal philanthropy and the love of our neighbour. It is not a Samaritan whom the priest allows to be in his blood, but a Jew. The priest, with cold selfishness, is conscious of his elevation above this layman, although he was of the same confession. The Levite also prides himself too much on his peculiar temple-purity. Even the Jewish innkeeper is not altogether free from the charge of heartlessness, for he allows the Samaritan to pay for his Jewish brother. How striking and how awfully true are these traits of inhumanity, as it begins to operate in regions where fanaticism leads to the hatred of those of a different faith ! Such fanatics cannot be content with striking down the Samaritan, and leaving him in his blood. They rob one another, and strike one another half-dead ; and their very priests and Levites leave the unhappy man who has been attacked by robbers lying in his blood ; and all this within the circle of one and the same fanatically excited confession. Thus the Jewish

nation, in the last war before the destruction of Jerusalem, was overrun by robbers and fanatics, the same persons being often both. No consecrated institution holds men together any longer, where love has grown cold, and is even regarded as a sin. In the circle of such heartlessness, every person is an obscure separatist, and every family a sect in opposition to the great universal Church of grace and mercy, and scarcely is the nearest, to say nothing of those at a distance, regarded as a neighbour. But calamity comes forth, on the one hand, with giant steps, and plunges the fanatic into misery ; on the other hand, mercy conducts the differently minded, and makes him an angel of deliverance for him. Thus the holy, inalienable humanity of benevolence and compassion breaks down those barriers of religious and national animosity, by which man in his selfishness can fancy that he does honour to God by his nation or his creed, while he has become worse than a heathen in his disposition. And as far as this humanity exerts its influence, and establishes a higher intercourse between calamity and mercy—as far as this pure unselfish human love reaches, it is manifest that man, simply as such, is neighbour to man, as far as he is man, as far as he can receive and return love. The good Samaritan is in all his features an image of the freest and richest mercy ; and this has given occasion to find in this parable an allegory of the love of Christ. Christ too was, in the eyes of the pharisaical Jews, an unclean person, a heretic ; and He it was who rescued prostrate, half-dead humanity from sin, while the priests and Levites never vouchsafed a glance at the deep wounds of their race. Thus the first parable delineates the mercy of love in its most general form, embracing all opposites, and overcoming all obstacles.

The parable of the man who made a wedding feast, in the first form in which Luke presents it (xiv. 16–24, compared with Matt. xxii. 1, &c.), is also, as we have already mentioned, predominantly a parable of mercy. The insulting behaviour of the persons who were first invited, who betrayed by their paltry excuses their contempt of the invitation, called forth, of course, the anger of the householder. But this anger revealed itself again as the ardour of an invincible love : he was angry, and sent forth his servants to invite other guests, till his house should be full of the poorest and meanest. And he resolved, in accordance with justice and honour, that ‘none of the men that were bidden shall taste of my supper.’ The banquet of this noble-minded personage represents the blessedness of the Christian spiritual life. Jehovah is the giver of the banquet. He had long before invited guests. The Israelites had been prepared for the great banquet, and had been invited to it. But the latter summonses must be distinguished from the first invitation ; now the feast was ready. These summonses coincide with the advent and ministry of Christ. But now the invited, as if preconcerted from the first, began to make excuse. The excuses of these persons are excused in a foolish manner,¹ con-

¹ Very often, exegetical pedants labour to make reasonable what in the Gospels is represented as foolish.

tradictory to the spirit of the parable, when the text is explained thus: that the first and second wished to settle their purchases; and when, as to the third, it is observed that the newly married Israelites, according to the law, were free for a year from military service (Deut. xxiv. 5). These excuses must from the first appear as worthless, and indeed contain their own refutation. For temporal and worldly business does not in itself prevent man from being a guest in the kingdom of heaven, but bondage of the will, the tumult of the passions by which he is impelled, and the confusion of a worldly mind, as it appears in all imaginable forms. This confusion is shown in this, that the two first, having made their purchases, wished to inspect them at night-time, when all field boundaries are obscure, and all cattle are black; and that the third has been made a vassal by his wife, which means more in the East than in the West. The earthly mind in its various forms makes men unsusceptible for the spiritual life of the kingdom of heaven; particularly as delight in earthly possessions, represented here by 'the piece of ground,' and in the love of power is symbolized by brandishing the goad over five yoke of oxen; and lastly, as slavish sensuality and surrender to men in love and fear, perversities which the hindrance arising from marrying represents. The subtle forms of opposition to the Gospel as they met the Lord in Pharisaism and Sadduceeism are everywhere animated by these various elements of the worldly mind. The offence against the giver of the feast consisted in breaking the word of promise made to him, and that his kindness was treated with contempt by worthless excuses precisely at the most joyous event in his life. But yet he gratified his ardent desire to make a festival. We cannot hesitate to understand by 'the poor, the maimed, the halt, and the blind,' whom he caused to be invited in haste from the streets and lanes of the city, in the first place, the 'publicans and sinners,' in contrast to the Pharisees. And when the servant is sent out of the city to invite the people who were lying about in the highways and hedges, this must apply to the Samaritans and heathens in contrast to the Jews in general. The hedges may refer to the extreme borders of Judaism, and to its being fenced in, as it were, from the Gentiles who were situated on the borders of the Israelitish territory. But here again, in the outward contrast an inner one is reflected. The Pharisees and Jews are in this case only the representatives of the worldly happy and the worldly-minded throughout the world; the publicans, Samaritans, and heathen, on the other hand, represent the poor in this world, the souls who are longing for the blessings of the kingdom of heaven. These poor persons, who could scarcely conceive of so high an invitation, the giver of the feast causes to be earnestly invited, yea, compelled to come in. Yet we must not impute to them a spirit of resistance against entering the house of the Church, which is to be overcome by force, as fanaticism has interpreted the passage; but simply the hesitation of joyful surprise in humble minds, who deem themselves unworthy of such an invitation. Thus

the house of the divine liberality is filled with guests who can celebrate the feast of love and of the spirit; the worldly happy remain without.

The love, generosity, and mercy which are depicted in this parable are shown in the next place as redeeming grace, which is not only applied to the suffering and the poor, but equally to the lost. It is thus exhibited in the parables of the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, and the prodigal son. In all the three parables, that overflowing, wonderful, self-sacrificing inspiration of love is delineated, which to the earthly mind must appear as foolishness. The shepherd risks the ninety and nine sheep in the wilderness, and even his own life, in order to rescue and recover the lost sheep; and his rejoicing on having found it far exceeds the pecuniary value of the sheep. And the very pains with which the woman who had ten pieces of silver seeks to recover the lost piece, and the joy with which she tells her neighbours of its fortunate recovery goes far beyond the bare value of the coin. But the father, who sees his lost son returned, prepares a feast such as he had never prepared for the elder son who had remained at home with him. So wonderful, even to the miraculous, is love, that even the angels of God, in all their number and glory, can 'rejoice over one sinner that repenteth.' Yet is this apparently foolish love, divinely wise grace. Mercy also acts with all the motives of wisdom. It came, in the person of the Son of man, to seek what was lost. When anything that God has made is lost in His world, a violation of the divine order is involved, against which not only love but also wisdom enters the lists. The beautiful completeness of his flock is lost to the shepherd, to make up the number one hundred; and the woman also dwells upon the round number of her savings—that she had exactly ten pieces of silver. The deficiency is so painful, especially in the father's house, where one of two sons is wanting.¹

Therefore the consideration of the whole guides mercy when it seeks for the single lost one. The divine regard for the symmetry and beauty of the eternal temple causes the divine love to exert itself about this or that stone in the structure. But there is also consideration of the individual, of its life and value. A lost sheep is indeed, as lost, a very poor creature; but the shepherd values it as a sheep of his flock; he gives it not up to the wolf; he pities its unhappy life in its wanderings and distress. The lost piece of money lies in the dirt, tarnished and useless; but still it is a coin composed of a noble metal, and stamped with the image of a prince. But the value of the lost son which remains to him in all his degradation, consists in his being the nearest relative of his father, that his being is derived from his father's being. Thus grace seeks to de-

¹ To the shepherd one of a hundred sheep is wanting,—to the woman, one of ten pieces of silver,—to the father, one of two sons, while in the other he can no longer have any real satisfaction. In a bolder form, but with profound evangelical insight, Angelus Silesius expresses the longing of God after the reconciliation of man by the words, 'I am of as much consequence to Him, as He is to me.'

liver the lost sinner, partly on account of the relation in which, according to the divine destiny, he stands to God and to the eternal family of God ; but also on his own account, because he is an unhappy being, because in his nature (*Substanz*) he has an unchangeable value, and because he is originally of divine descent. The parable of the lost son is a gospel in the Gospel. It has been said, that here is reconciliation without mediation through Christ, and so it has been erroneously assumed that every parable must exhibit the whole rule of faith ; the parable of the lost sheep and its shepherd is already forgotten ; and in this of the lost son, it is not understood what is meant by the father's running to meet him with agitated heart, and falling on his neck and kissing him. The divine salutation in the heart of the returning sinner, the first blessed feeling of grace, is here exhibited in the most beautiful manner.¹ Every stroke is to the life. The youngest son loses his inheritance, by separating through mere selfishness his own property from his father's, withdrawing from his father into the paths of worldly pleasures, and squandering his property in the indulgence of sensual lusts. He is punished by famine, by the want of the peace of God in the land of vanity, and by the lowest degradation, that he, an Israelite, must prolong his life in a most dishonourable existence, as swine-herd of a heathen, a most servile and disgusting occupation—till at last he must vainly wish to live upon the swine's fodder, and therefore sank into a depth of misery, which made the lot of the most unclean animals an object of envy. But by these means his awakening is brought about. This is expressed with admirable beauty : ‘ he came to himself’ (*εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθών*). He reflected on the happy lot of the *hired servants* at his father's, and resolves, ‘ I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against Heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son ; make me as one of thy hired servants ! ’ The hired servants were not the offspring of his father. If we are not disposed to consider them as merely allegorical figures, which is precluded by the fact that their happy condition made so deep an impression on the prodigal, their tranquillity denotes the tranquillity of creation, particularly of the irrational creatures, which formed so lively a contrast to the miserable state of the distracted sinner, and admonished him to turn from his evil courses. The confession, ‘ I have sinned against Heaven,’ is very significant ; by every sin a heavenly nature is violated and disturbed. Compassionate grace could not be depicted in a more striking manner than is shown in the conduct of the father. The lost son brings the confession of his guilt before him ; but grace has expelled the gloomy element in his repentance ; the petition, ‘ Make me as one of thy hired servants,’ has died in his heart. He cannot affront the father with this monkish or slavish sigh of distrust. But the father rein-

¹ Olshausen remarks, that in the parable of the prodigal son human activity in the work of conversion is delineated. But the divine activity also is not wanting in this parable.

states him joyfully in his filial dignity: orders his servants to put on him the best robe, and a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: he must be seen again in the full array of sonship. Then he commands them to kill the fatted calf, and to prepare a feast, because this son who was dead, is alive again; he was lost, and is found.¹ He therefore prepared for him a feast of restoration with the highest joy, devotion, and distinction. The elder son forms a difficult element of this parable. It seems a contradiction that he should be contrasted with the lost son as remaining at home, and should yet be irritated with his father for showing compassion to his brother. But if we closely look at it, traces of the same lost condition will gradually show themselves in the secret recesses of his soul, with which he upbraided his younger brother. In his legal good conduct he is outwardly unblameable, but inwardly he is not more in harmony with his father. He is not of one mind with him in mercy; he no longer knows his father's property to be his own; he is not dutiful to him; he even refuses to go into his father's house, where the feast for the return of his brother is celebrated, so much is he offended at the festive sound of the music and at the dancing. How strikingly is this feature apparent in the conduct of the Jews when the Gentiles became Christians! They went with heathenish rancour out of their Father's house in which grace celebrated their redemption-feast. And for a long time the elder son cherished a secret embittered feeling against the Father; for he fancied that he had served Him so many years, and never transgressed His commandment, but the Father had never yet estimated his conduct according to its merits. It is evident that he had no inward delight and joy, from his morose external correctness of deportment. A fearful truth lies in the words, 'Thou hast killed for him the fatted calf; yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I should make merry with my friends.' He never found a real feast of soul in his legality. But, in truth, he fain would have made merry without idea and occasion, as his brother had done in a foreign land; this now comes out with his chagrin. With a feast of the spirit he had nothing to do; this is proved by his ill feeling towards the feast for his brother. His last words are full of bitterness and falsehood. 'But as soon as this thy son was come, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf' (ver. 30). He was unwilling to call the returned prodigal his brother, though obliged to recognize him as his father's son. He exaggerates and misrepresents his irregularities, and describes the expense of the feast as an excessive indulgence of the prodigal, and wastefulness. He even depreciates his father's character; and his own degeneracy, which had been hitherto con-

¹ If we attempt to explain the particulars of the description, the best robe may denote the rejoicing of the son with the father, the reconciliation. But the seal-ring (*δακτύλος*) is not equivalent to the seal or sealing; it rather denotes the filial right to act and seal in the father's name. The sandals are a sign that the reformed one can go in and out freely. The fatted calf, in the singular, indicates that the father spared no expense, but provided what was of most value.

cealed under outward propriety of conduct, now comes to a head. Thus mere outward righteousness is always brought to shame when it sees the feast of grace. It cannot endure the sight of sinners being saved by grace. In the tumult of envy which this spectacle arouses, all the selfishness, coarseness, and depravity which had been hitherto concealed, break forth. The history of the Jews in the days of the Apostle Paul proves this; and the history of the hierarchy in Luther's time on the large scale, while on the small scale it has been repeated a thousand times. Thus, for example, a feeling of chagrin may be observed in many sanctimonious rationalist writings respecting the conversion of Augustin, and his high reputation in the Christian Church. The elder son is a character that perpetually recurs in the history of the kingdom of God. But it was not within the scope of the parable to narrate the sequel of his history. His fall first became visible when that of his brother was retrieved by grace. This grace also calmly confronted his perversity with soothing and admonitory words. The divine mercy is as much illustrated by the closing words of the father, with which he admonished the elder son, as by the joy with which he hastened to meet the younger.

The parable of the prodigal son is plainly reflected in the parable of the Pharisee and publican (Luke xviii. 9-14). The two forms which stand in presence of the grace of God in such different frames of mind, again make their appearance. But the elder son here develops himself fully in his self-righteousness, and the younger stands before us in the attitude of ripened repentance. This advance, however, is not the only difference of the two parables; for a turning-point is here introduced, since a man is depicted as praying with such complete success as to obtain the redeeming grace of God. We must here connect several parables with one another as representations of the life of prayer, by which man becomes sure of the grace of God and of all its aids. The parable already mentioned forms the beginning. From the connection we gather that the publican is the principal person in it, as is also shown by the structure of the conclusion. Christ spoke this parable 'to certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others.' It has been remarked, that, since a Pharisee is introduced in this parable, Christ could not have addressed it to the Pharisees, for in that case the form would have been unsuitable. But on this hypothesis, no publican could have ventured to be present at its delivery, nor any priest or Levite at that of the parable of the good Samaritan. Since the figure of the Pharisee was not chosen to put into the shade any individual of that sect, or the sect itself, the question appears to be unimportant, whether the Pharisees were present or not at the delivery of this parable. The parable recognizes, indeed, that the Pharisee had the pre-eminence of dignity and conformity to the law, before the publican: he is with propriety placed first. It is not his zeal for the law in itself that brings him into a disadvantageous position, but the delusion that by this zeal

he was righteous in God's sight. With emphasis it is said that he stood thus in the temple and prayed *by himself*.¹ He thanked God that he was not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican ; and then he tells what he really is—he fasts twice a week, and gives tithes of all that he has. This shocking poverty of the feeling of life, which would make out of two useless excesses of a religious and civil legality the true riches of life, and even a righteousness before God, shows his character. The keynote of his prayer is contempt of other people ; and the worst thing in it is, that he condemns the publican personally while celebrating his own reconciliation with God. The publican was an Israelite as well as he, and had an equal right to enter the temple. But, bowed down by the consciousness of his sinfulness, he did not venture to go far into the sanctuary. The sanctuary reproved him as the visible majesty of God, and perhaps the Pharisee himself appeared to him as a cherub who threatened to hinder his entrance into paradise. He would not so much as lift up his eyes to heaven, not even his hands, but smote upon his breast, saying, ‘God be merciful to me a sinner !’ The judgment of Christ follows this contrast : ‘ I tell you, this man went down to his house justified, rather than the other ; for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.’ Thus, then, man obtains grace in the way of sincere humiliation before God, and of believing prayer ; not in the way of legal performances. But, owing to his spiritual slothfulness no less than to his pride, he is always inclined to enter the path of self-righteousness, and thus to estrange himself from the grace of God and from true spiritual life. This striving of man to realize righteousness in his religious and civil performances sinks him a thousand times into the most unspiritual Pharisaism, which sharpens his performances in mere external things, while spiritual death gives the most ghastly signs of its having seized on the inner man. And a thousand times the poor publican stands agitated by the feeling of his guilt, and burdened by the condemnatory sentence of the Pharisee, and in the internal sentence that he passes on his own soul, sees the day-spring of God’s grace. Thus both the Pharisee and the publican are world-historical forms ; they walk immortal through all ages of the theocracy and of the Christian Church.

While this parable shows how the sinner obtains grace by means of prayer, the parable of the unjust judge (Luke xviii. 1-8) represents how Christians who are in a state of acceptance with God obtain at last, in times of severe trial, His merciful aid by means of persevering prayer. Here, therefore, the unjust judge represents the image of God, as in another parable the unjust steward denotes the pious man. In both cases these delineations are manifestly to

¹ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν. Perhaps he did not venture to utter aloud so offensive a prayer. Taken literally, the words would mean that he did not really address himself to God, but in vain self-idolatry had only himself before his eyes, though ostensibly praying to God.

be regarded as allegorical, in distinction from symbolical ones. God can only according to outward appearance seem like the unjust judge when He allows the pious to suffer long under the oppression of the world and the attacks of the evil one, when, as in the instance of the sufferings of Christ, He seems to continue inexorable in the deepest sufferings of the innocent. But, according to His nature, He is always the merciful One. Parables in which such bold allegorical strokes occur, peculiarly require an explanation, such as is given here and at the close of the parable of the unjust steward. Olshausen has justly referred to the often-recurring outward appearance of the inexorability of God, in which He only expresses His own unsearchableness in order to explain the figure of the unjust judge. According to him, the oppressed widow is to be regarded as an image of the persecuted Church ; and her adversary who oppressed her, an image of the princes of this world. The explanation which Jesus appends to the parable favours this interpretation. He calls attention to the words of the unjust judge. As the poor widow was always importuning him to extend to her the protection of the law against her adversary, he said to her, ‘though I fear not God nor regard man, yet because this widow troubleth me I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me.’¹ ‘Hear,’ said Christ, ‘what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge His own elect, which cry day and night unto Him, though He acts towards them with lofty reserve,² and therefore inscrutably? I tell you that He will avenge them speedily.’ The closing words, ‘Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, will He find faith on the earth?’ express the same thought in the strongest manner. God will not only respond to the prayers of His elect, but will so far surpass them, that the appearance of the Son of man, with which the redress of their wrongs will take place, will be incredible to the majority. In this parable, therefore, the whole praying life of the Church is marked as the condition on which the entire mercy which God cherishes for His Church in His Spirit will be manifested. The appearance of not hearing, of unmercifulness for a long time, confronts the supplications of the Church ; but when the hearing comes, the unfolding of the mercy will be so glorious, that it will be met by the appearance of unbelief in those who had implored it.³ But though this parable, according to its precise interpretation, is a living image of the Church in all ages, it is equally an image of individual believers. The destitute soul is reminded of the full power of constant access which God grants it in the privilege of prayer. In the way of prayer it can be certain of the superabundant unfolding at a future time of God’s mercy.

A kindred parable, but presented in the form of a parabolic conversation, we find in Luke xi. 5-8. Here the Lord describes a

¹ μὴ ὑπωπάξῃ με, lest she strike me under the eye, or clench her fist at me.

² So, I believe, we must translate καὶ μακροθυμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς, according to the connection and the literal sense of the words.

³ Compare Ps. cxxvi. 1, ‘When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion, we were like them that dream.’

person who knocks in the middle of the night at his friend's door, to seek his assistance on a pressing occasion. Another friend, travelling by night, has turned in for a lodging, and he wants three loaves to entertain him ; so he comes to his friend with a request to lend them to him. Will this friend, in such a case, call to him from within,¹ ‘ Trouble me not ; the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed ? ’ ‘ I say unto you,’ says Christ, ‘ though he will not rise and give him because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will arise² and give him as many as he needeth.’ Both friends have excellent motives which clash with one another. The one entreats under the pressure of a sacred obligation which friendship, and indeed hospitality, had imposed upon him in a most urgent form. For the other, it is hard to disturb his little ones in their sweet sleep so suddenly and alarmingly, especially by the opening of the house-door. But still he does not consider it well to set his own motive against that of his friend. The unabashed urgency to which his friend is impelled by the requirements of love forms an exciting power which overpowers him and makes him quite alert to render aid. And if he were not his friend, yet he could hardly withstand him. How much more, then, will God, in His deep, heavenly repose, faithfully and graciously hearken to the supplication of man in his midnight distresses—that supplication which in its purity always proceeds from the holiest solicitude of love, honour, and duty !

The experience of God’s great clemency which redeems and rescues the sinner, can only be completed when the life of love again awakens in his breast and begins to gush forth. It will therefore express itself in reciprocal love and gratitude, and in their preservation. This truth the Lord exhibits in the short parable of the two debtors (Luke vii. 41, 42). Both were in debt to the same creditor. The one owed him five hundred pence, and the other fifty ; and since they could not pay him, he frankly forgave them both. Simon the Pharisee, to whom Jesus had addressed this parable, was obliged himself to decide, that he to whom the creditor forgave most would love him most. Jesus then declared to him, that the sins of the woman who had occasioned this conversation were forgiven, since she had given proof of greater love ; ‘ but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little.’ It plainly follows from the connection of the parable, that the forgiveness of sins is to be considered not as the consequence, but as the ground of love to the Lord. But the leading thought of the parable is this, that from the fulness and power of a man’s proofs of love we must draw conclusions respecting his love, and through that, respecting the recon-

¹ It is in accordance with the connection and the harmonic construction of this parabolic discourse to take ver. 7 as an inference, so that the question involves a negation, and is such as the following : ‘ Who will have a friend who should give such an answer (even though he well might) ? ’ Probably the recollection of the parable of the unjust judge has contributed to alter the interpretation of this parable.

² The ἐγέρθεις would be quite superfluous if it were not significantly used in reference to the preceding ἀνατάσ.

ciliation from which alone it can proceed. Where the love is great, the reconciliation is great; where there is little love, the reconciliation is slight; that is, the reconciliation scarcely exists, or is not yet begun. And the more the love of man unfolds itself, so much more deeply he enters into the blessed kingdom of love and mercy. But the more he gives himself up to an unloving disposition, the more he loses the right state of mind for mercy and the hope of it.

Christ shows in three great parables, that if men would obtain mercy, they must exercise mercy. In the first, the parable of the unjust steward (Luke xvi. 1-8), we see the blessing of mercy; on the other hand, in the two others, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and of the servant who owed ten thousand talents (Matt. xviii. 23, 35), the curse of unmercifulness is depicted. In the exposition of the first parable, we must, above all things, not overlook the key which the Lord has given, since this parable is more difficult than the others. This remark applies particularly to the words, 'The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.' The unfaithful steward must be regarded as one of the children of this world, since he deceives his lord. And the debtors are, at all events, people who live in the same worldly element as the steward; they become parties at once to his unfaithfulness. Of his master we know nothing that sets him above the region of the children of this world. It strikingly indicates his worldly mode of viewing things, when we are told, in ver. 8, that he actually commended his unfaithful servant. It is true, he praised him only for his cleverness—that by the exercise of a great though unrighteous liberality he had made provision for his own maintenance. Now thus the children of light ought to be wise in their way, in accordance with their own character. Money is almost an imperishable idol, the Mammon whose worship will not vanish even among Monotheists;¹ for which reason Christ calls money by the name of the idol. But He calls it still more definitely the Mammon of unrighteousness; not only because it passes through so many unrighteous hands, but because it never purely corresponds to its proper destiny, an ideal standard of value for worldly things and relations. Money (*Geld*) should express the essential value (*Geltung*), and thus secure righteousness in commercial transactions; but in its actual use it is often a caricature of its destiny—a false standard of value, and therefore a medium on which a thousand false estimates and returns, and therefore deeds of unrighteousness, depend. But

¹ Mammon is probably not a mythological divinity, but in the Syrian and Phœnician commercial life has been transformed into an idol, just as is now often done in a half-jocose, half-serious manner. Bretschneider: 'Μαμωνᾶς. Heb. מָמוֹן, fortasse significat id cui confiditur ut LXX. Ακονητή, Jer. xxxiii. 6, θησαυρούς; Ps. xxxvii. 3, πλοῦτον, reddiderunt; vel est ut multi putant nomen idoli Syrorum et Pœnorum, divitiarum præsidis, i.q. Pluto Græcorum.' Olshausen: 'Augustin remarks on this passage—congruit et punicum nomen, nam lucrum punice Mammon dicitur. Gold appears in contrast with God, as a person, an idol, a sort of Plutus, without its being proved that an idol of this kind was worshipped' (i. 231).

the children of light should always feel about money as if something alien and unsuitable belonged to it, and therefore should devote it most willingly to making friends with it—friends who may receive them, if they now suffer want, into everlasting habitations. It would not be consonant to the spirit of Christ's doctrine, if we were so to understand these words, as if the pious could by works of mercy purchase a reception into everlasting habitations, or that this reception is dependent on the generosity of the perfected in the other world. In this parable we find ourselves placed in the kingdom of free mercy. According to this view, the leading thought is: Sanctify temporal possessions, which generally become a burthen to men; make them an organ of blessing by your liberality; make them the channels of your mercy. If you so devote the temporal to mercy, you will make friends for yourselves, who will give you in exchange the eternal for the temporal, and receive you into their everlasting habitations. Here in the everlasting habitations of the Church, and in the other world in the everlasting habitations of the perfected kingdom, you will be welcomed as belonging to the family. Whoever devotes his powers to mercy, living and dying, he will fall into the arms of mercy. Olshausen has developed the leading thoughts of the parable in an ingenious manner, so that all the parts obtain a definite meaning. The rich man is the world, or the prince of this world. Opposite to him stands another, the true Lord,—God as the representative of those who receive the destitute into everlasting habitations. The steward stands in the middle between the two. 'He labours with the property of the one for the objects of the other.' We are here reminded of the better sort of publicans, who had an entirely different position from that of the Pharisees. They were outwardly, indeed, very much mixed up with the world, but their inner man was inflamed with a longing after the divine. The Pharisees, on the contrary, were 'outwardly in close conjunction with the divine, as the representatives by birth of the theocracy; but their inner life was attached to the world, and they made use of their spiritual character for temporal objects.' But the parable, by certain definite features, requires the exposition of Olshausen to be in some degree modified. According to ver. 13, the rich man is Mammon himself—the allegorical Plutus—the spirit of gain, or the worldly mind so far as it amasses wealth in the spirit of selfishness. Every man of wealth or property is a steward in the kingdom of this Mammon. But the pious man of wealth does not serve him faithfully; he embezzles, according to worldly notions, the treasures which he ought strictly to employ for self-interest, since he employs them in the spirit of liberality and sympathy. Lastly, he is too much for the calculating genius of gain, who purposed to dismiss him from his service; that is, the steward by his liberality puts himself in a wrong position to the spirit of gain in the world; he is in danger of being reduced to poverty. But this knowledge of his situation does not frighten him back into worldly covetousness. He wishes, indeed, not to starve, nor would he like, in order to live, to

be a bungler in a trade that he had not learnt, or to practise the fawning servility of a mendicant. So he goes confidently and boldly forward in his way; he takes still bolder steps in disregarding his lord's interests, for he contributes to the kingdom of love and mercy. The parable makes it manifest, how in the Christian Church the rigidity of selfish acquisition ever more becomes relaxed in the service of love, and how the Christian spirit contributes to a brotherly communion in the enjoyment of goods.¹ The practical application made by Jesus calls this unfaithfulness of the pious against Mammon, faithfulness in little, the least that can be required of a Christian. 'If ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous Mammon, who will commit to your trust the true [riches]? If ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?' Here the thought is more decidedly brought forward, that money is not to be managed according to the mind of the wealthy world of Mammon, but according to the Spirit of God. Lucre is dangerous as well as unessential for the Christian. If he succumbs to the spirit of the world in this little thing, the true riches cannot be entrusted to him, and he cannot come into the possession of the eternal goods intended for him. This saying struck the Pharisees, and was designed to strike them; but we are not at liberty to suppose that this parable was a mere allegory on the Pharisees and publicans.

The rich man in the next parable, at whose gate poor Lazarus was laid, forms a counterpart to the unfaithful steward. Recently some have attempted to maintain that this parable is founded on Ebionitish views. We are not to suppose that the rich man had to atone in eternity for his sins in the present life; nothing of this sort is to be found in the Gospel. It is not said that he had not given relief to Lazarus; rather, he was punished because he was rich and had lived prosperously in the present world. On the other hand, nothing is known of the good conduct of Lazarus; rather, he was admitted into heaven simply because he had been poor in this life. To the rich man special praise has been awarded, because he wished to send a messenger to his brethren who were yet alive from the kingdom of the dead, that they might be warned by his fate. This last circumstance tells against the preceding remarks. The rich man, at all events, admits that he might have escaped the place of torment if he had been suitably warned, and that his brethren might yet escape it. Did it ever enter his thoughts, that they must divest

¹ It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader here, that the Christian community of goods is an ideal community realizing itself with the perfecting of the Church, and resting on the principle of freedom, holiness, and love, while modern communism would make a profane realistic community by a forced method on the principle of self-interest. The way and manner in which Christ lets the unjust steward set aside the requirements of his lord, points to the living mediation between the kingdom of private property and that of the Christian community. The circumspection of the mediation is shown in this, that, in the first instance, he lowers the demand from a hundred to fifty; in the second, only to eighty. But the praise bestowed by the idol of wealth on the steward might be referred to the communistic ideas of the worldly mind.

themselves of their wealth? He says nothing of the sort, but rather that they must repent (ver. 30).¹ Criticism has indeed not altogether overlooked this circumstance; just so the description that the rich man ‘was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day.’ It is indicated with sufficient clearness that Lazarus had not to rejoice in any sympathy on the part of the rich voluptuary. He lay at his door (‘laid at his gate’), covered with sores, and *desiring* (*ἐπιθυμῶν*) to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man’s table. Yea, even the dogs which came licked his sores. The expression *ἀλλὰ καὶ*, ‘but also,’ with which the mention of the dogs is introduced, makes them appear not as friends, but as sorry rivals of the destitute. The dogs here spoken of are such as in the East run at large in the towns and greedily seize whatever food they can find. The abundant fragments of the rich man’s luxurious table attracted them in great numbers. They gathered round Lazarus and licked his sores. He was obliged to share his scanty fare with these greedy dogs, among whom it was his lot to be thrown.² Lazarus dies; so also does the rich man. The funeral procession of the former was a guard of honour from the other world: the angels carry him into Abraham’s bosom.³ The interment of the latter was an earthly ceremonial; with emphasis it is said, ‘he was buried.’ The rich man had charged his memory with the name of Lazarus.⁴ He was surprised in the other world, in Hades,⁵ to see this man in Abraham’s bosom, while he was tormented in the flame. And this is exactly the finest, keenest master-stroke of the parable, that the rich man is disposed to treat Lazarus with an unconscious continuation of his earthly arrogance even here, and with contempt. Lazarus must come down to him into the fire, and cool his tongue by applying the moistened tip of his finger; perhaps only in this slight manner, because he had seen the poor man in the impurity of his sores. Lazarus must undertake the errand to his father’s house, and convey information to his brethren as an apparition from the other world. Lazarus here, Lazarus there. Thus he regards him with the same eyes as before, and with the same estimate. Lazarus must be his errand-boy. The arrogance with which he intrudes into Heaven from Hades he foolishly grounds in part, even in the presence of Lazarus, on his descent from Father Abraham. But even in Abraham’s presence he is not teachable. He contradicts his assurance that Moses

¹ See Neander, *Life of Christ*, § 219, p. 354.

² See Olshausen, *Commentary*, iii. 63. Some are fond of finding here an important feature, by regarding the dogs as belonging to the rich man, and explaining their licking the sores of Lazarus as sympathy. In applying this view, it is said that the rich man’s dogs showed more pity to the poor man than himself. Yet we must here take into account the habits of dogs in the East.

³ [See the beautiful sentences of Augustin (*De Civ. Dei*, i. 12) on this, beginning, ‘pompa exequiarum magis sunt vivorum solatia, quam subsidia mortuorum.’—ED.]

⁴ ‘Probably symbolical—לֹא יָזַר the helpless, the forsaken.’—Olshausen.

⁵ Olshausen justly remarks that we are not to confound Hades, the kingdom of the unblessed dead before the last judgment, with Gehenna, in a stricter sense the abode of the unblessed after the last judgment.

and the prophets gave sufficient instruction about time and eternity for men who are willing to hear. ‘Nay, Father Abraham, but if one went to them from the dead, they will repent.’ His anxiety for his brethren’s house implies a covert censure of Moses and the prophets, that they were not sufficient to bring persons to repentance; and a bitter reproach of the divine economy, that it neglected him in his religious need, and had suffered him to perish unwarned. The declaration with which Abraham closes the conversation is justified by the events that followed. Even the resurrection of Christ made no impression on the hearts of those who had not been willing to learn the awful importance of eternity from Moses and the prophets. Lazarus throughout the whole parable does not utter a word. Hence it has been inferred that we know nothing of his disposition, and that, according to the Evangelist, he was transported to heaven on account of his former sufferings. But not to say that, as Neander remarks, he is not the principal person in the parable, and that from his relation to Abraham we may conclude that he bore his sufferings with pious resignation, his silence in his present situation must be regarded as most impressive. He is silent before the gate of the rich man, where he calmly lies, a beggar of princely pride and unblemished honour. He is silent also in Abraham’s bosom (whence the rich man would recall him for his service in hell), a humble, blessed child of God, without self-exaltation, in the bosom of glory. If we duly estimate the great virtues of silence, we shall see that of Lazarus come forth conspicuously. This parable would have been better understood if the powerful impression of a transaction between the spirits of heaven and those of hell had not led men’s minds away from the leading thought. Olshausen justly remarks, that this conversation is to be regarded only as a living reciprocal action between the two domains of life. His remark is also worthy of notice, that the description here given relates not to eternal salvation and damnation, but to the intermediate state of departed souls from death to the resurrection. ‘In our parable, therefore, nothing can be said of the everlasting condemnation of the rich man, inasmuch as the germ of love, and of faith in love, is clearly expressed in his words.’ We cannot indeed but acknowledge in him the feeling of sympathy for his brethren; but, in the whole form which it takes, there is a mixture of the most impure elements, namely, of ill-will and unbelief, and even of superstition. The disclosures which Olshausen finds here respecting the relations of the intermediate state must be admitted; namely, ‘(1.) That departed souls are congregated in one place; (2.) that they are separated according to the basis of their character into the good and the wicked; (3.) that after death a transition from the good to the wicked, or the reverse, is impossible.’ But, as we have already remarked, information respecting the detail of things in the other world is not the essential design of the parable. The key to it lies in the declaration of Father Abraham: ‘Thou in thy lifetime receivedst (*ἀπέλαβες*) thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is

comforted, and thou art tormented.' Of the mere life-position of the rich man in this world on the one hand, and of the poor man on the other, nothing is said, even remotely ; but of the way and manner in which the rich man conducted himself in his prosperity, and the poor man in his adversity. The one had enjoyed his good things.¹ He had seized upon them as his felicity, and by this enormous delusion had laid the foundation for his future sinking into the fiery torment of unquenchable desires and ever-devouring circumstances. The other received his evil things, his grievous lot ; and by his resignation to the divinely decreed suffering, he became capable of blessedness. Reposing in Abraham's bosom, he could find a heaven in that calm retreat ; while the other, in his fearful agitation, would fain have set heaven and earth in commotion. These destinies, so distinctly marked, considered in their parallelism, would show the judgment of the Gospel to be far exalted above the reproach of Ebionitism. But these destinies intersect one another, and for this reason,—because the rich man kept his earthly goods for himself, without mercy towards the poor man ; because he turned that abundance itself into a curse which should have been a blessing to the other ; and because the poor man in his indigence had borne with resignation the misery of the world together with the misery of the rich man. The true poor man is merciful in the manner in which he bears unenviously and quietly in God the burden of the world, its discordancy ; wherefore he will obtain mercy. The false rich man, who receives his property as booty for his sensual indulgence, is without mercy by the very manner of his luxurious living ; retributive justice confronts him in eternity with its punishments. Dives and Lazarus are world-historical personages.

The rich man, by worldly luxury, allowed himself to be seduced into unmercifulness, and thus incurred heavier guilt, since he had experienced the liberality of God in his abundant possessions, and was therefore bound to exercise liberality. But much heavier is the guilt of him, who in the spiritual life experiences the mercy of God, and after such an experience treats his neighbour in spiritual relations with unmercifulness. This criminality is depicted in the parable of the unmerciful servant. The king who would take account of his servants (Matt. xviii. 23-35) is evidently an image of God in the administration of His strict justice. When he begins to reckon, there is one who owes him ten thousand talents. In the presence of eternal rectitude, the very best servant of God is a sinner burdened with an immeasurable debt. The servant is unable to pay. So man cannot possibly wipe away his own sin. His lord threatens the debtor to sell him with all his family, according to the ancient law of debt, in order to recover as much as possible. Thus the punishment which strikes the sinner, falls also on those who belong to him. But the debtor, in his terror, pleads for a respite ; and his lord yields to his

¹ And this is a more severe reproach than that which is popularly expressed, 'He had taken an excess of good things.' According to Strauss (i. 633), the latter only is to be regarded as a reproach, and not the former.

prayer, takes compassion on his family, and remits the whole debt. It deserves special notice, that the debtor asked for a respite; it did not amount to a frank admission of his insolvency; he could not leave the legal standpoint. He shows the same temper also in his conduct immediately after towards his fellow-servant, who owed him a hundred pence: ‘He took him by the throat, saying, Pay me what thou owest;¹’¹ and without being softened by his entreaties, ‘cast him into prison till he should pay the debt.’ His hard-heartedness is represented in sharp, bold strokes. This took place on his going out from the chamber in which his lord had just forgiven him his immense debt. As he had thrown himself at his lord’s feet, just so his fellow-servant fell at his, and in the same words as he had used to his lord, besought a respite. And the claim was so trifling. By these traits is depicted the legal harsh demeanour of a member of the theocracy, or of the Christian Church, towards his brethren who are in debt to him. His fellow-servants were sorely grieved at such conduct, and told their lord. They plainly recognized another higher right—the right of mercy. Their lord now called the unmerciful servant into his presence and reproached him for his baseness. He handed him over in wrath to the tormentors, and to a painful imprisonment, till he had discharged his whole debt. But how could he exact from him the debt which he had already remitted? According to our civil law, to revoke the remission of a debt is not permissible. But in the legal relation in which this king stood to his servants or slaves, it was allowable for him to impose a heavy fine, or to exact the debt he had remitted. He had remitted the debt because he besought him (*ἐπεὶ παρεκάλεσάς με*). But the real suppliant gives the assurance that he believes in mercy, and therefore that the spark of mercy is in his own heart. If this debtor had supplicated in truth, he would have given a guarantee that he also practised mercy. His having been the recipient of an act of mercy, bound him to the exercise of mercy. This his lord plainly reminded him of, in the words, ‘Shouldst not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant, even as I had pity on thee?’ Therefore the act of remission was nullified by his own fault. If the old debt had been remitted, he had now incurred another, greater one; had he incurred no new debt, the old one remained. According to this law which he had set up against his fellow-servant, the law of inexorable legality, he is now handed over to justice. His lord first treated him according to the law of justice, for the sake of the truth of justice. Then he treated him according to the law of mercy, or of supplication; for supplication as an expression of faith in mercy is a prophecy of mercy, and so its germ. But since he had practically repudiated this law, his lord returns with him to the first law, and holds him a prisoner in this stern hard world of exacting, avenging, inexorable justice,

¹ The reading *εἰ τι*, preferred by Lachmann [Tischendorf and Tregelles], gives certainly a much more expressive, sharper sense than *ἢ τι*. The personal violence preceded the demand for payment, and the claim was not substantiated.

until he has paid all—for ever, if he does not learn to believe in the kingdom of mercy. The latter proviso we must make, for his lord had not changed his own nature in itself; but towards him he is the strict judge, not only for the sake of justice, but of truth; and this conduct is at the same time concealed mercy. We are not to suppose, from the particular traits here given, that a pardoned sinner in the stricter sense is depicted, who by his decidedly unmerciful conduct towards his fellow-men again falls back into his old state of condemnation. Christ distinctly assumes that he to whom much is forgiven, also loves much. But the possibility is certainly expressed in the parable, that a man may lose the beginnings of a life in grace by unmercifulness, or that he may decidedly disturb and obscure the continuance of his life in reconciliation with God, by more or less rash single acts of natural or legal hardness. And in this reference, the parable is a solemn warning. But if we keep in view the meaning of the words, that the lord took account of his servant, and remitted his debt, the whole life in Christianity is marked as a life in the kingdom of mercy, and therefore mercy as the highest duty. The Christian has, by his profession, from the first acknowledged himself to be a heavy laden debtor to God;—the central point of his prayers is supplication for forgiveness—his whole faith is grounded on the remission of sins; therefore his duty to show mercy to all who need mercy, and are susceptible of it, is expressed as the great and prime duty of his life. But it has happened a thousand times that the professed servant of God has come from his Lord's presence in the ordinance of the Church, after absolution, and immediately, according to another rule of action, the purely legal, has treated his fellow-servant with the greatest harshness while the absolution was still sounding in his ears and should have found an echo in his heart. And thus he often comes from baptism, or from the communion, or from prayers; and a thousand times he is in danger, as he comes out, of forgetting the remission of his own great debt, and of seizing his neighbour by the throat for a small one. And if he falls into this temptation, it proves that his supplication was not of the right kind, and therefore that he has not really obtained absolution. His whole transaction with the merciful Lord was rendered nugatory, because his supplication was no real reflex and witness of eternal mercy. We need only take a glance at the history of the Church, or even at our own lives, in order to see what a fearfully clear and reproving mirror of a thousand instances of spiritual unmercifulness, under the banner of eternal mercy, is held up in this parable. And as in the rich man the unmerciful practices of men of the world are condemned, so in the parable of the two debtors the unmercifulness of professed Christians is condemned. And as the former suffered torment because in his unmerciful selfishness he had extinguished in himself the true capacity of enjoyment, so the latter came under the tormentors of the legal world, in the gloomy circumstances of self-tormenting both in this world and the next, and of endless

quarrelling with humanity, because he did not thoroughly believe in forgiveness, and therefore could not forgive. This law is distinctly expressed in Christ's closing words (ver. 35). But the unmercifulness of the latter is the greatest. The former closed against his neighbour the treasures of temporal means; the latter closed against his own heart the treasures of mercy.

Thus we see in a succession of pictures the agency of the love of God, which has its central point in Christ, as it establishes and extends the kingdom of God in its two great forms of life, in the glory of grace, and in the fervour of mercy. Every parable is a special world-image of this agency of love; each one exhibits a new revelation of its spirit and operation, as it is reflected in a new glorification of the world; and so the representation of the widest circle of its agency stretches forward to the most decided manifestations of its world-glorifying operation. In this series we see grace constantly approaching the fulfilment of the time when it will change itself into the form of judicial righteousness, in order to complete the erection of the kingdom of God, or in order to free the finished structure of ideal humanity from the rubbish and scaffolding which surround it.

The world of the merciful Samaritan is the world of merciful love in its widest extent. It embraces heaven and earth, the good and the evil. Hence it oversteps all the limits of nationalities and confessions, and chooses the strangest instruments among foreigners, dissidents, and heterodox, in order to put to shame and to conquer the unlovingness of national and confessional pride. It operates in a thousand forms on earth. Children and women, even heathens and savages, are active in its service. It is the healing balsam which streams forth from human hearts in their philanthropy and sympathy. Its symbolic representative is the good Samaritan; its real chief in its quiet world of wonders is the Crucified. If we see in this image the great labour of love, the second world-scene shows us the festival of love; we are taught its special object. It has prepared a great feast for humanity. Men are to assemble in its hall for an eternal feast—a feast of the highest divine communion, spiritual joy, and blessedness. The feast is announced in the morning of the world against the world's evening; the first invitations have already been issued. And the glory of this love is most of all verified in not allowing itself to be perplexed by the despisers of its feast among the invited—that even in its wrath towards them it remains true to itself: it sends out messengers and seeks new guests among the poorest and most forlorn. And throughout all ages of the world this is the boldness of love, that it still makes efforts for winning hearts for the spiritual life of heaven, notwithstanding that the most honourable, consecrated, and dignified administrators of its outward ordinances often appear estranged from this life, and even in a state of awful death. But not without labour does love convert into guests of heaven those who oftentimes would fain have appeased their hunger with the food of swine. A

new world opens. We see grace go forth on its sacred errands to seek out the lost. The great history of reconciliation is unfolded before our eyes in the parables of the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, and the prodigal son. The anxiety of the good shepherd, who is ready to lay down his life for his sheep, shows us the impassioned, self-sacrificing, uncalculating devotedness of the love of the Redeemer. The painstaking housewife is the lively image of a whole world of beautiful redeeming solicitudes in the heart of Christ and His Church. The restoration of the prodigal son, which the father celebrates by a feast in his house, is the history of numberless experiences of grace, and of its welcomes in the hearts of believing penitents, and an image of every evangelical jubilation in Christendom which sounds forth from time into eternity. But the life of Christ in us must verify itself under trial. The parts are shifted. Before, man was for a long time irresponsible to the call of his God ; now, God appears to be irresponsible to reconciled men. We see humanity in its genuine christological life of prayer turned towards salvation : the work of God's faithfulness in the trial and distress of His people, the glowing operation of His purifying power in their earnest supplications, is unveiled to us. The innermost life of humanity is disclosed ; its wrestling after the righteousness of God and the completion of His kingdom, in the praying publican, in the persistently supplicating widow, and in the friend made over-importunate by necessity. Then, in the parable of the thankful debtor, we see the community of believers in the overflow of their love ; they love much because many sins have been forgiven them. We see how humanity in its choicest specimens gratefully gathers round its Redeemer. And now the Christian spirit begins to transform the old world of selfish acquisition, the ice-bound kingdom of Mammon, into a new genial world of brotherly kindness, of benevolence, and of the common enjoyment of God's blessings. But we see how, against this bright side of the new world, a dark night-side is presented ; the world of secular and spiritual unmercifulness that constantly becomes more intense, represented by the rich man and the unmerciful servant. With these parables we approach the representation of the judgment as it is given in the third cycle of parables. Already, in the earlier parables, our attention has been directed to the judgment by single traits ; as by the priest and Levite, by the despisers of the great feast, and by the elder brother of the prodigal son. But as the kingdom of God in its absolute power and glory embraces the whole world, those persons who reject His mercy are still within the range of His government, and fall into the hands of His justice. Yet, while His justice visits them with its judgments, it remains one with His mercy. But as it is the office of mercy to found and to build the kingdom of God, so it is the office of justice to purify and to complete it.

The parable of the day-labourers who each received one penny, notwithstanding the unequal times of their labour in the vineyard (Matt. xx. 1-16), must stand at the head of the parables of this

group ; for it shows how the justice of God exercises a rewarding retribution which is wholly animated by the munificence of grace. Grace determines and gives a brilliancy to the hire of these labourers, and equalizes it. The parable shows us, therefore, how the administration of God's justice is perfectly one with that of His love. A proprietor hires labourers for his vineyard : the first, about six o'clock in the morning, at the beginning of the day ; others, at nine o'clock (about the third hour)—people whom he finds standing in the market-place, detained there by the attraction of earthly things, loungers in the region of worldliness ; others, again, about noon ; a fresh set, about three in the afternoon ; the last, an hour before sunset, or about the eleventh hour. These latter answer to his inquiry, ‘Why stand ye here all the day idle?’ ‘Because no man hath hired us ;’ and at his bidding they go immediately into the vineyard. Here, then, we have a series of conversions exhibited according to the measure of their earlier and later temporal beginning. Some of these labourers have grown up in a life of piety, and from the first have been active in it ; others have been called later ; many have stood all day idle in the market-place, and enter the Lord's service not till the evening of life. Now, according to the relations of earthly justice and rewards, it would be natural to expect that the payment of these labourers would be reckoned according to the term of their labour. So the Jews probably expected that the heathen who should be converted in the world's evening, would receive a smaller reward than themselves. Also in modern times it has been maintained by rationalist theologians, that the neglected opportunities of the sinner in the time before his conversion can never be repaired—that the loss of time follows the converted man himself into eternity in an irreparable shortening of his felicity. But this parable seems to have been specially constructed to explode such an erroneous opinion. It belongs to the majesty of grace, that from the bosom of its eternity it can restore the otherwise irretrievably lost time. Hence also the circumstance is explained, that God could allow the heathen to go on in their own way thousands of years without losing sight of them, and similar mysteries. The power of grace shows itself in the reward of the labourers as the parable depicts it. The proprietor agrees with the earliest labourers for one penny ; to the next he made the indefinite promise, that ‘whatsoever was right, that they should receive ;’ and with the last he appears scarcely to have made even this condition.¹ And when evening was come, the lord of the vineyard desired his steward to call the labourers and give them their hire, in such order, that he began with the last and ended with the first. Now when the labourers who were hired in the early part of the morning saw that those who were hired at the eleventh hour received a penny, they expected much more, and murmured when they also received only a penny. Manifestly the parable expresses first of all the equal

¹ The words, *καὶ δὲ ἀνὴρ ὁ δίκαιος, ληψεσθε,* in the 7th verse are omitted by Lachmann [Tischendorf, and Tregelles].

position of the earlier and later converted in the state of blessedness. But if the parable merely represented this truth, that salvation would at last be equal for all the converted, although they entered at different times into the service of the kingdom of God (as Neander thinks), the most striking features of the parable would be to no purpose. Rather it is clear, that the labourers hired last enjoyed the distinction of being first paid. And since in proportion to their time of labour they could not expect much, one penny was for them extraordinary good fortune. The first labourers, on the other hand, not only received their penny last of all, but embittered their own joy in it by expecting more. The outward equality of their pay, therefore, became an inward inequality in favour of the labourers who were last hired. How are we to explain this circumstance? Manifestly we must regard the labourers who were first hired as saved persons. For the one equal payment denotes the salvation to be imparted equally to all. But there is originally a difference in men's capacity for salvation, and in proportion the fulness of salvation must be different to different persons. Now these first labourers appear to be delineated as more legal, calculating natures, whose capacity for salvation was not of great extent. They bargained with the proprietor for a penny. Labouring in his vineyard had become irksome to them—the chief point in the recollection of their labour is the burden and heat of the day. And they think it strange, that the others should be placed on an equality with them in point of wages. Since they ground their complaint on the principles of daily wages, the proprietor points out to them, that even on these principles they had received what was due to them. As to the last hired, on the other hand, the lord of the vineyard appears to take into account that they had not the opportunity till late of entering into his vineyard, and possibly they had a battle with themselves to exchange towards evening their indolent mode of life for hard work, and yet went briskly to their task without a stipulated reward. At all events, they appear now as, in proportion, the more richly rewarded, for this reason, that the amount of the reward must have surprised them. Thus a great fact in the kingdom of God seems to be reflected in their relation to the labourers who were first hired. The kingdom of God is the kingdom of spirit, in which the power of time and the relations of nature are abolished—in which a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years. In this kingdom it can be, then, of no decisive importance, in what outward temporal extent any one has lived for the kingdom of God, in what number and measure he has accomplished laudable works in its service. Rather the point of importance is, with what energy he can surrender himself to eternal love, and in what abundance he is able to receive it. And it is frequently found that the spiritual service of one convert forms a strong contrast in its energy to the formal service of another in its outward extent; as, for example, the conversion of the woman who was a sinner contrasted with the religiousness of Simon. In this contrast, one hour of human con-

version and of divine reconciliation may have greater weight in their spiritual importance, than many years of life which have been spent under the reciprocal action of a well-considered human piety, and a proportional scanty flow of divine blessings. The differences of the measures of blessedness in the kingdom of God are adjusted, therefore, not according to the calculations of a mercenary disposition, or according to the outward measure of religious service, or according to the rules of human industry, but according to the relations of power and energy in the spiritual life. But viewed under these relations, it may be asserted as a maxim, that a man's capacity for spiritual blessedness is smaller in proportion as he is more disposed to make stipulations with God, and greater in proportion as he is bold and large-hearted in joyful surrender to the free love of God. According to these relations of the energy of love, the determination of the dynamic inequalities is regulated, which allows the justice of God to enter into the circle of equality which embraces all the saved as saved. The justice of God is, according to its nature, not an outward forensic justice, deciding according to outward laws,—but it is a spirit, and therefore decides spiritually; it is one with free grace, and therefore gives to man in proportion as he can apprehend it as this free power of love. The parable expresses this truth in the words which the lord of the vineyard addressed to one of the dissatisfied labourers: ‘Friend, I do thee no wrong; didst not thou agree with me for a penny? Take that thine is, and go thy way. It is my will to give unto this last ($\thetaέλω δοῦναι$) even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own? Is thine eye evil because I am good?’ The concluding words are also explained by the intention of the parable: ‘So the last shall be first, and the first last; for many are called, but few chosen.’ According to Neander¹ and others, this addition does not suit the parable, but is only outwardly attached to it, since the parable should express simply the equalization of all the converted in heavenly felicity. But we have seen how the parable also gives prominence to the dynamic inequalities within this equalization, and how deeply they enter into its main scope. According to this view, the parable terminates quite naturally with the words just quoted. It is a fact, that many of those who were called early into the kingdom of God were last in what related to spiritual fulness, and that many of those who were later called, appeared in this respect the first. But how can this relative fact be expressed in one sentence which states the matter quite unconditionally—The first will be last, and the last first—since Abraham and the elect of the Old Covenant generally belong to the early called, and, on the contrary, among the later called even the majority will present themselves as the inferior organs of glory? First of all we have to answer, that it belongs to the nature of an apophthegm to express a manifold conditioned thought in an unconditional form, since it must influence by the paradoxical emphatic expression of its chief element. But the warrant for this lies in the

¹ *Life of Christ*, § 240, p. 385 (Bohn).

symbolical nature of the apophthegm ; and so in this instance, the last which will be first are those who appear before the Lord with the slightest pretensions ; while inversely, the first are those who by their undue pretensions became the last. This sentence was most strikingly fulfilled in the time of Christ : the Jews, who were the first in their pretensions, became the last ; while the last, the Gentiles, advanced to the rank of the first. But even among the Gentile Christians the same phenomenon was repeated, and the ultimate reason is, that many are called, but few chosen. Even because only a few are chosen, so, many of the early called, as they grow up from childhood, in all confessions, according to their internal capacity for salvation, occupy of themselves decidedly a subordinate situation in the organism of the kingdom of God. But the few chosen also enter into their high position although their calling in time reached them later ; for they meet the infinite energy of the love of God with a corresponding energy of a yearning and trustful disposition. Thus the kingdom of royal love obtains its organization, because the relations of eternity, or of the spirit, overcome the relations of time. Those who find love in justice, move towards the centre ; on the contrary, those who only see justice predominating in love, move towards the circumference. But the circle of equal blessedness encloses them all ; each receives his penny.

In the parable we have just now considered, the administration of God's justice is exhibited in its refined and lofty spirituality, in its peculiar glory. This contemplation is continued in the parable of the ten servants among whom the ten pounds were divided (Luke xix. 11-28). The former parable shows us how the divine justice requites labour outwardly unequal with an equal reward. In the latter, we see how the faithful employment of an equal number of pounds, on the part of different servants, is followed by an unequal success, and consequently by an unequal reward. But in the former case an internal dynamic inequality was plainly apparent, notwithstanding the equality of the reward ; and in the latter we see how this inequality, which is here exhibited in its full extent, is equalized by every labourer's receiving a reward which exactly agreed with his gains. And this constitutes the peculiarity by which the divine justice is infinitely exalted above the human, that it can exhibit the essential life in law, and equally in law the essential life ; that it does not do away the great inequalities of life in the equality of right ; and that it faithfully preserves the pure equality of right in the inequalities of life—that it can be justice and grace at the same time, in the one majesty of its administration.

As to what relates to the form, it has been thought that in this representation the Evangelist has committed the mistake of confounding two parables together, and that to restore their integrity they must be separated, so that one depicts the relation of a king to his rebellious subjects (vers. 12, 14, 27), and the other the relation of a rich lord to his servants.¹ But the blending of these two parts

¹ See Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 636.

into one living unity constitutes the very pith of the parable. The kingdom of Christ is a realm which first of all was imperilled by a rebellion of its legitimate citizens, the theocratic nation ; and its Ruler must gain the kingly power by travelling to a distant land which would place Him in a position to assume it on His return. Now, what was the first duty of His faithful servants whom He had left behind among the rebellious citizens ? Should they take arms in order to make an attempt to gain possession of the kingdom for their Lord?¹ But this is precisely what this prince was obliged to forbid his servants. In this critical interval they were to administer his property in a perfectly peaceful agency, to make use of their abilities, and to employ the time in promoting his interests. Could our Lord have more impressively told His disciples that in the interval between the ascension and His second advent they were not to think of a worldly exhibition of His kingdom, or of vindicating His royal dignity and identifying His word with the laws of social life, but that they were only faithfully to administer the real goods, namely, the spiritual, which He had left behind, in their unassuming evangelical offices, in order to form a basis for the outward appearing of His kingdom by means of its spiritual riches ? But at a future time, when He returns with kingly power, they will also surround Him in royal splendour—be placed over the cities of His kingdom, and assist Him as warriors to execute judgment on the rebellious. Such being the leading thought of the parable, we can understand why the Lord delivered it to His disciples exactly at the time when He was going with them to Jerusalem, and they were expecting that the kingdom of God would directly appear. Luke takes particular notice of the close connection of this discourse with the occasion of its delivery (ver. 28) : ‘ And when He had thus spoken, He went before, ascending up to Jerusalem.’ Now, if we look at the several particulars of the parable, we meet with traits of great significance. The certain man to whom the parable relates is a nobleman, a person of high birth ; namely, Christ the chief of humanity. But as in that age Jewish persons of rank frequently resorted to the Emperor at Rome in order to get themselves invested with princely dignity in Palestine, so this noble personage went into a distant land in order to obtain a kingdom and to return home ; an evident reference to His ascension, and His return at a future time for the manifestation of His kingdom.

The nobleman, before setting out, calls his ten servants, commits to their care ten pounds,² and says to them, ‘ Occupy till I come ! ’ The great number of his servants indicates the dignity of his house ; the number ten is the round number of the world’s course. Each servant receives only one pound : by the equality as well as the smallness of the amount, we are led to think not of the gifts of

¹ ‘ Instead of a capital for trading, he ought rather to have sent them arms.’ Modern criticism often proposes emendations of this sort in the Gospel history. We have here a specimen how, without intending it, it can inflict a wound on the very vitals of a biblical passage.

² The Attic mina (*Mνᾶ*), equal to rather more than £4. (Smith’s *Dict. of Ant.*)

grace entrusted to them considered in themselves, but of the official calling in which they find their expression. Every disciple of Christ is like the rest in his calling; and such a calling appears very mean in contrast with the splendour of the world. But his citizens hated this nobleman, and sent a message after him with the declaration, 'We will not have this man to reign over us.' We are here reminded of the embassy which the Jews sent to Rome to remonstrate against the government of Archelaus;¹ and we are thus shown how Christ, in the contemplation of His theocratic claims to the throne of David in the sense of eternal duration, might wish to bring it into comparison with the way and manner in which the partizans of Herod at Rome canvassed for the earthly throne in Israel. The fulfilment of this part of the parable was first of all shown by the refusal of the Jews to receive the tidings of Christ's glorification after His ascension and the day of Pentecost. But in a wider sense all unbelievers in the whole course of time belong to these rebels. When the nobleman returned, invested with kingly authority, he commanded the servants to whom he had given the money to be called before him, that he might know how much each had gained by trading. The first came forward and said, 'Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds.' And he said unto him, 'Well, thou good servant, because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities.' The second came forward and said that he had gained five pounds. He was put over five cities. In this description the gain is first of all to be estimated. With the pounds are gained pounds; that is, from a few messengers and witnesses many others are made; His people, who are called to testify of Him, become numerous. But next, the difference in the gains of the different servants is strikingly exhibited. With one pound one had gained ten pounds; another, only five. If this difference lay entirely in the difference of industry, the servant would scarcely pass muster with the gain of only five pounds; but other causes appear to have co-operated, namely, the diversity of talent, and especially the talent of energy, in order to account for such a difference in the result. Then the recompence comes under consideration. Since the kingdom of Christ has now become a monarchy, His faithful servants become royal governors over its cities, and according to the measure in which they have gained with the sums entrusted to them. In the success of their activity in the kingdom of the Cross, they had developed their qualification for their activity in the kingdom of glory, and the measure of it was fixed. The juxtaposition of the two faithful servants is sufficient to illustrate these truths. But another comes, saying, 'Lord, behold, here is thy pound, which I have kept laid up in a napkin; for I feared thee, because thou art an austere man; thou takest up that thou layedst not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow. And he saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* xvii. 11, § 1. Compare De Wette, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, on the passage.

will I judge thee, thou wicked servant. Thou knewest that I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow: Wherefore then gavest not thou my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required my own with usury?' Now follows the sentence: 'Take from him the pound, and give it to him that hath ten pounds.' The servants object, he has already so much; but their lord answers, 'Unto every one that hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him.' The wicked servant allowed the pound entrusted to him to lie unemployed. It is characteristic, that he had laid it aside wrapped up in his napkin; he had used neither his pound nor his napkin; in cold indolence he had neglected, concealed, and denied his calling. From the reason he alleges, it is evident that he had no attachment to his lord, that he could not regard his master's business as his own. We cannot, as Olshausen has done, look upon his excuse as indicating a noble nature, which was merely held back by the timidity and scrupulosity of the legal standpoint from putting out his pound to interest. Christ reproaches him as a wicked servant, and condemns him out of his own mouth. His excuse was therefore hypocritical. Devotion to his lord was wanting. He stood on the egoistic, and hence on the slavish standpoint. He undervalued his calling and the talent entrusted to him as a matter of insignificance, which, as he thought, was not worth considering whether he could gain or lose by using it. Trading with the sum entrusted to him seemed everything; the sum itself as nothing; and accordingly he reasoned thus: If I gain large profits with the pound entrusted to me, I shall gain no advantage from it—my lord will take it all; but if I suffer loss, I shall be made responsible for it without mercy. Hence it will be best for me to lay the pound by for him, and take care of myself. Thus the man of a slavish spirit calculates in the Lord's service. He feels not how great the gift of his calling is; for surrender to the love that has called him is wanting. He thinks that everything in religion depends on his working. But he is afraid of becoming a saint, since he cannot regard as his own gain what he is to gain for God. On the other hand, he is so very much afraid of failures in Christian endeavour, and on that account postpones his conversion, as many Christians in ancient times deferred their baptism. Wherever a slothful servant of Christ looks upon his calling in relation to the harvest of the world, which Christ will expect from him, as a troublesome, contemptible sowing, and on that account neglects it, this parable obtains its fulfilment. But Christ passes sentence on the servant according to his own showing. Exactly because he expects great things from the improvement of every gift and calling entrusted to man, must every one make the best use he can of his pound. The very least which the slothful servant could have done, would have been to put his pound in the bank; without any great exertion on his own part, he would then have secured at least the usual interest of the money. He might give

back his calling to the Church, who would then transfer it to some one else (place the pound in another person's hands for trading with), and the Lord would then receive the profits which He might expect from a faithful application of it.¹ Instead of this, he retained the calling, but neglected it, and thereby inflicted an injury on his lord's affairs. As a punishment, his pound is taken from him and given to him who had ten pounds. All the rights of the Christian calling which the unfaithful neglect, will one day revert in the world of perfect reality to those who have been faithful in their calling ; and precisely those who have the richest blessing of power and fidelity will obtain the richest reversion. This expectation is thoroughly certain, since it is a settled matter that the correct relations of power and being in the kingdom of God, and therefore the relations of rank in those who sustain them, must one day appear in a perfect, clearly expressed organism. Whoever has the reality, to him also will be imparted the glory of the appearance ; but whoever is destitute of real life in the calling of Christ, from him will be taken away the outward calling to exhibit it. After this sentence passed on the slothful servant, sentence is also passed on the rebels. They are already defeated by the glorious return of the lord ; he now causes them to be brought and slain before his eyes. In this is contained the announcement, that the sentence of condemnation on the enemies of Christ will take place at His return before His throne.

The parable of the talents (Matt. xxv. 14–30) has such an affinity to the preceding, that by critics of different schools² it has been regarded as only another recension of it, or as the original from which the other is taken. But notwithstanding the affinity of its leading features and thoughts, it is distinguished from it by a marked peculiarity. As to its position, it is connected with the parable of the ten virgins, which immediately precedes it, by the thought that the delay of Christ's return is a probation for His disciples, and at last will suddenly come upon them with a dangerous surprise ; and by this same thought it is clearly distinguished from the parable of the pounds. In both parables, Christ's servants are individually tried by the great distance which separates Him from them. But in the former it is the distance of space, here it is the distance of time, which forms the ground of their trial. *There*, it is questionable whether the candidate for the throne will return from a distant land invested with regal power ; here, the master of the household is a long time away from home, and his servants, owing to the un-

¹ In the parable of the pounds in Luke, the lord tells the unfaithful servant that he ought to have given his money into the bank ($\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\theta\mu\tau\alpha\gamma\sigma\alpha\tau$) ; on the other hand, in the similar parable of the talents, Matt. xxv., it is said, 'Thou oughtest to have put my money to the exchangers' ($\tau\omega\iota\tau\theta\mu\tau\alpha\gamma\sigma\alpha\tau$) : this difference corresponds to the different character of the parables. The offices are returned to the Church ; but the gifts of grace, which are in danger of being injured, are to be rendered productive by their possessors connecting themselves with the most active leaders of the Church.

² Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 634 ; Olshausen, iii. 283. On the other hand, Schleiermacher, *Über die Schriften des Lukas*, p. 239.

certainty whether he will ever return, and the long destitution of his personal appearance, are tempted to slothfulness and the neglect of what is entrusted to their care. According to this view of the parable, the first thing that strikes us is the relation of the lord of the servants to the kingdom. He is not described as a person of high birth, but simply as ‘a man travelling into a far country.’ He has three servants. If in the number of ten servants the relation of the disciples of Jesus to the whole course of the world is made apparent, here the three servants mark the work of the Spirit which is committed to the circle of the disciples on earth; for three is the number of the Spirit. And if in the one pound the equal discipleship of all Christians, in its humble aspect in the eyes of the world, is represented, so here the trust committed to the disciples appears to us rather in its essential importance.¹ According to this proportion, one of these servants had a sum three hundred times greater than in the former parable. Poverty-struck as the calling of the apostles and evangelists may appear on the secular side, thus splendid is its inward spiritual side; however faint the outward lustre of the calling, great are its golden contents, the gifts of grace; for we can understand by the talents nothing else than the gifts of grace bestowed on the disciples. The calling of the disciples is equal: each has only one pound. But the gifts of grace are various: to one servant five talents are entrusted; to another, two; to another, one. On this rest the inner differences of Christian discipleship, and hence it is explained that one with his pound could gain ten pounds, while another gained only five. This diversity in the gifts of grace which Christ dispenses in the kingdom of redemption is regulated by the diversity of natural gifts which God has dealt out in the kingdom of creation. The master, on his leaving, fixed for each of his servants the number of talents according to their ‘several ability’ (*κατὰ τὴν ἴδιαν δύναμιν*), it is said in the parable. What in the domain of human natural life was intellectual power, in the kingdom of Christ, when purified and consecrated by grace, becomes wisdom and knowledge; what in the former was a power of the soul, here becomes a holy flame of love; and thus every gift, from being a mental natural talent, is converted into a spiritual talent of the kingdom. After the distribution of these gifts of grace, the master straightway departs (ver. 15). The ascension and Pentecost nearly coincide, and, according to the inner nature of things, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is the immediate consequence of Christ’s ascension. Now a long period elapses; a dangerous term of probation for the servants. The reckoning takes place at the final return of their lord, and it then appears that the two first servants have dealt faithfully with their talents. Each of them has gained as much as was entrusted to him; consequently the spiritual capital entrusted to the believer is exactly doubled by its faithful application. But why only doubled, while the capital of the calling, the pound, has realized ten times its own amount? The calling operates on

¹ The talent (*Τάλαντον*) contained 60 minæ, worth about £243, 15s. of our money.

the broad, wide world, where an apostle in fulfilling his vocation might gain half the world, or bring a whole generation under his power. But the gift of the Spirit operates within the kingdom of the Spirit; hence it will gain just so much life as is specifically related to it. For every positive power of the kingdom of God, a proportionate receptive power exists in the spirit-life of the world destined for the kingdom of God. Outwardly this simple gain of the essential gift of the Spirit may appear less than the tenfold gain of the official calling; but according to the scale of importance in the kingdom of God, it stands perfectly equal to it. For the mental gift, in its faithful application, is exactly that which imparts to the calling its destined productiveness. In truth, it is the greatest gain when it is granted to a Christian to reclaim five talents of human mental gifts from their wild growth and perversion for the life of the kingdom of God; hence an abundance of new offices of life arises. The reward, also, which is here granted to the faithful servants, points to the profoundest relations of the kingdom of God. They were faithful over a little;¹ now they are placed over much. And this exaltation is thus expressed—the rewarding Lord says to each, ‘Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!’ He admits them into the fellowship of His own life of joy—the fellowship of His perfected rest. The former parable makes the reward of God’s servants for their fidelity in their temporal calling to consist in the glory of their heavenly calling: they were placed over many cities. Here, their fidelity in their human spirit-life, as it was peculiarly conditioned and diversified, is rewarded by their being raised to the sabbatical rest of the unconditioned spirit-life of their Lord. There, they received their reward in a new, heavenly investiture; here, their temporal striving is rewarded with the most entire rest from toil. There, heavenly labour is the blessing on fidelity to their earthly calling; here, heavenly repose of spirit is the consequence of temporal activity of spirit in divine things. In the former case, those who had maintained their fidelity become God’s vicegerents; in the latter, they become members of His family. Thus one parable describes the outward side of their inheritance; the other parable, the inner side. But the servant who had received only the one pound appears very similar to the slothful servant in the former parable. He calls his lord a hard man, reaping where he had not sown; and says, that for fear of him he hid his talent in the earth. He returns it to him unimproved. Manifestly he also was induced by an undervaluation of his gift to hide it in the earth. That in this manner he gradually lost the life of the divine Spirit and sunk the life of his own spirit deep in the earth, the parable could only express by showing how he never properly made the entrusted talent his own, since he brings it again to his lord as *his* (‘Lo, there thou hast that is thine’), with which he had nothing to do. But his lord rebukes him as a ‘wicked and slothful servant.’ His condemnation is then expressed as in the former parable. His talent

¹ It is said *ἐπὶ ὀλίγῳ*, not *ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ* as in the former parable.

is taken from him and given to him who had ten talents. This is designed to teach, that the faithlessness and apostasy of God's wicked servants produces on His faithful servants a most salutary reaction, a stimulating effect, by which their life acquires an extraordinary elevation.¹ But the unprofitable servant is here not merely punished by being deprived of his pound. He is cast into outer darkness, where is wailing and gnashing of teeth.² When he kept back a gift of the Spirit from the kingdom of God, after he was pledged to employ it, the necessary consequence was, that he became an enemy of this kingdom; hence the severest punishment was inflicted upon him. Finally, if we notice the circumstance that the servant was guilty of this unfaithfulness with the smallest sum, we shall see, on the one hand, the connection of the religious self-determination of man with his gift. This servant had, in proportion, the least religious capital. But on the other hand, we also see the full manifestation of freedom in the unfaithfulness of the servant; for he too had his talent, and could have gained a second with it. It was therefore his guilt that he so conducted himself as if he had no vocation for the kingdom of God, and by this guilt he incurred his condemnation.

Thus we see how the three parables, which exhibit the rewarding justice of the Lord in such great acts of allegiance, by degrees bring forward more distinctly its punitive administration. This punitive administration gradually comes forth in the following parables in all its majesty. Especially we find parables which announce beforehand this punitive justice; we might designate them parables of warning and threatening justice.

The constant nearness of the divine judgment is continually announced to men by the prevalence of death. The nearness of death, when it makes itself perceptible to sinners, is everywhere an omen of threatening judgment. This is shown in the parable of the foolish landholder (Luke xii. 16–21). This man was rich; his fields were crowned with an abundant and splendid harvest. He found that his barns were too small, and resolved to build greater, in order to stow in safety his fruits and his goods. And then he would 'delude his soul'³ to look upon this store for many years, to eat, drink, and be merry. Here God Himself makes His appearance in the parable. 'Thou fool!' He said, 'this night thy soul shall be required of thee;

¹ Compare Acts v. 11, 12.

² 'The βασιλεῖα is viewed as the region of light, which is encircled by darkness. In reference to this point, the metaphorical language of Scripture is very exact in the choice of expressions. Concerning the children of light who are unfaithful to their vocation, it is said that they are cast into the σκότος; but respecting the children of darkness, we are told that they are consigned to the πῦρ αἰώνιον; so that each one is punished in the opposite element.'—Olshausen, iii. 287.

³ 'In this case neither σῶμα nor πνεῦμα could have been employed. According to the divine ordinance, nourishment is required by the body, but the πνεῦμα has relation to nobler than sensuous blessings and food. The ψυχή, as being capable of education and development, can refer as well to the lower region of the σάρξ as to the higher one of the πνεῦμα. In this very thing consequently does the point of the thought before us lie, that he gave up to the σαρκικοῖς that ψυχή, which he should have consecrated to the πνευματικοῖς.'—Olshausen, ii. 300.

then whose shall those things be which thou has provided ? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich towards God.' Judgment overtook him. The death of such a man is in itself a judgment, because it exhibits with one blow all his labour as vain, his whole calculation as false, his striving as folly, and meets his self-will with an inexorable counter-working fate, but especially by the result, that it places him in his nakedness and destitution before God. Thus God's judgments incessantly proceed through the whole world in the most appalling forms and visitations. But the threatening omens go before the judgments themselves in all the signs of death. In these circumstances, in which death stands for judgment, he is the antipodes of the good Samaritan. He likewise knows no limitations of confessions or nationalities. As the former (the good Samaritan) restored the half-dead to life, so the latter hurries them to the grave. The administration of salutary severity stands as a complement over against the administration of salutary kindness ; and the ministers of justice join themselves to the ministers of mercy.

But the same man, who is threatened by the impending judgment because his heart is set on earthly things, calls also for punitive retribution, since by this vain striving he becomes an unfruitful tree for the kingdom of God. This truth is exhibited in the parable of the barren fig-tree (Luke xiii. 6-9). This fig-tree was in a very favourable position. It stood in its owner's vineyard, under the care of a faithful gardener. And yet, for three years in succession, it brought forth no fruit. Then the owner said to the vinedresser, 'Cut it down, why should it impoverish¹ the ground on which it stands !' But the vinedresser interceded for the tree on which sentence had been passed. 'Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it and dung it : if it bear fruit, well ; and if not, after that thou shalt cut it down !' In the theocratic symbolic, the people of Israel, in consequence of its early awakening to the knowledge of the true God, were in its prime the early fig-tree among the nations (Hos. ix. 10). But now, in consequence of its being stiffened in the unspiritual observance of traditions, it had become an unfruitful fig-tree. Its unfruitfulness was the more unnatural, because it enjoyed such distinguished care in the garden of God. Already, at the first appearance of Christ, a judgment had been manifested on the people, for they were not capable of receiving Him. But He, whom the faithful vinedresser resembled in spirit, implored a respite for them. This respite took place in the time of Christ's ministry, and was then on the point of expiring, without the fig-tree's promising to reward the last labour bestowed upon it. Therefore the doom that had already been pronounced by the Judge was coming on with hasty steps. But the Christian Church was also such a fig-tree in the garden of God in its outward form, and in a wider sense the whole human race, and indeed, in the most varied appearances, every Christian and every individual man. The spirit

¹ [More than the *ἄχθος ἀραιόης* of the Greeks, for which see *Plat. Apol.* p. 28.—ED.]

of justice which presides over the earth, continually presses forward the developments of human life with accelerated speed, to judgment. But the spirit of mercy exerts a force in an opposite direction, and is ever keeping back the threatening judgments.¹ This makes the time of salvation always more precious and more momentous. Long-suffering counts the days of the granted respite, and the greatest facts in which the power of Christ's love and the monitions of His Spirit are manifested, announce most of all as warning prognostics that judgment is nigh.

But at last the threatened judgments make their appearance. Man can suffer them. This is shown in the following parables, especially the parable of the marriage of the king's son (Matt. xxii. 1-14). Here that feast appears, which was before exhibited in its relation to mercy, in its opposite relation to judgment. The greatest blessing of earthly life is, that man is invited in it to the feast of God's felicity ; and it is his heaviest loss in life, if he has neglected this invitation. But his punishment does not consist in mere destitution. The destitution of essential life, of life in life, must, according to its very nature, become a tormenting fire in the centre of life—a death in life. A king makes a great feast to celebrate the nuptials of his son ; the guests invited are his subjects. Evidently the king is God Himself, and His son is Christ, as He is on the point of uniting Himself with His bride the Church. That the persons invited, if they accept the invitation, belong themselves to the life-form of the bride, is not a point for consideration ; for Christ is perfectly certain of His Church as a whole, although individuals of the invited guests should be wanting. Indeed, believers themselves, in their individual capacity, are to be regarded only as wedding guests who partake of one joy with the Bridegroom. Since the guests are the king's subjects, they would be obliged to comply with the invitation, although he had summoned them to compulsory service. Thus motives of the highest honour, of the highest love and joy, and of the highest duty, combined to induce the persons invited to appear in the most joyful manner at the great festival. Their refusal is therefore something quite monstrous, and in its threefold aggravation is to be regarded as a rebellion. To the first invitation they gave a simple refusal, without alleging any reasons for it : ‘they *would* not come.’ Their lord condescends to request them by a second set of messengers. He represents the abundance of the feast, the embarrassment of his household if the oxen and fatlings should be killed in vain, and that all things were ready. How strikingly in these traits is the earnestness, the ardour of love in the preaching of the Gospel, depicted ! But the persons invited turn away with contempt, and go their way to their usual avocations. Some even proceed so far as to insult and kill the servants who invited them. The king hears of this, and is wroth ; he sends forth his armies and destroys those murderers, and burns their city. This is the first act of retributive justice. It has

¹ 2 Peter iii. 9.

been said that no reason has been given why some of these ungrateful guests killed the servants of their prince who invited them.¹ Certainly no motive is alleged for their conduct ; nor can any be given, any more than for the fact in the department of spiritual life, that the indifferentism with which the earthly minded man refuses the invitation to the blessed feast of reconciliation with God, can change itself into a positive demoniac hatred against that invitation and its bearers. It is, indeed, an awful thing, that by the guilt of those who are invited, an avenging sword and a dismal conflagration must proceed from the marriage feast of the King of humanity, by which the despisers of the feast perish with their city,—that therefore the greatest gift of God to humanity is rejected by many with a rebellious spirit which can only be put down by the most fearful judgments. In the description of the burning city, there is certainly an obscure allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem ; yet we must not overlook the fact, that all the features are symbolical in the most comprehensive sense, so that, for example, the burning city may reappear in Constantinople taken by the Turks, and often in the history of the world ; last of all, in the mysterious conflagration which will accompany the last judgment. The parable now more distinctly falls in with the representation in the similar parable contained in Luke. We see that the marriage feast of the king's son cannot be rendered nugatory. 'The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy,' the king says to his servants. He therefore sends them into the highways with a commission to invite whomsoever they can find. The servants execute their errand in the most comprehensive manner ; they invite good and bad, and thus the house is filled with guests. We here see how powerfully the preaching of the Gospel is carried on in the world according to the will of the Lord, and how the free invitation addressed by Him to all is at special times more strongly urged by His servants.

The most righteous in their ecclesiastical and civil relations are too bad (*οὐκ ἀξιοί*) if they are self-righteous ; the most unworthy, on the other hand, are good enough if they seek righteousness in redemption. Grace, indeed, would not be grace in its divine majesty if it could not redeem, and wished not to redeem, the most unworthy. Therefore the contrast of good and bad which was formed in the old-world æon makes no difference, if only the good acknowledge with penitence the evil in their lives, and the bad lay hold of goodness in Christ as the destiny of their life. But the emphasis with which this majesty of grace must be announced, in order to put an end to all doubt and despondency, may be badly managed by some servants, as soon as they carry it on in an antinomian spirit—as soon as they accommodate the doctrine of faith to the earthly mind, and grant admission into the Church or absolution with undue facility. In a similar manner, false hearts may misinterpret the Gospel by falsely hearing it, and wish to unite the

¹ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 638.

service of sin with assurance of salvation. But with this a new fall of man is originated worse than the first, just as in the case when unbelief rejects the Gospel. Wherefore the judgment of God pervades the kingdom of grace, and with more intense severity, because the conscious service of sin which will find its way into this kingdom is of all offences the most heinous. Men cannot indeed unite the peace of reconciliation with sin, but they may make the attempt both in doctrine and life; and then always, as an outrage against the holy pure spirit of mercy, must call forth the greatest judgments. The parable exhibits this fact in the king's going in to take a view of the guests, and finding one among them who had not on a wedding garment. This image has been explained by a reference to the Oriental custom of furnishing a splendid garment for the guest who came to the feast of a man of rank.¹ On the other hand, it has been remarked that it is not certain that this custom was prevalent in the time of Jesus.² Then again it has been urged, that Oriental customs are characterized by their constancy;³ and as a proof, the narrative of Samson's wedding feast has been adduced (Judges xiv. 11-13). Samson promised to his thirty companions, whom the Philistines managed to bring with an evil intent to his wedding, thirty sheets and thirty change of garments, on the condition of their explaining his riddle. He might not like to make such a present to the perfidious guests; but since established custom seemed to require it, he imposed on them the task of earning the gift by his riddle. But in our parable a king is speaking before a multitude of poor people, whom he had most graciously invited. It is therefore presupposed that he would not let them want the festive garment.⁴ Therefore this man, in the imagery of the parable, is a vulgar, coarse-minded being, who knew not how to value the king's kindness, or to enter into the spirit of the feast—who did not esteem the master of the feast nor the occasion, nor even respected himself. But according to the spiritual meaning this guest cannot be considered as a self-righteous person, ignorant of the righteousness of faith; for this class has already been sentenced under the image of those who ungratefully refused the invitation. That this man appears among the guests in the house of mercy, marks him as one of those who assented like the rest to the doctrine of justification by faith, and tried to regard the consolations of salvation as belonging to himself. But his delinquency consisted in his not entering into the spirit of the feast, into the holy and sanctifying import of reconciliation. As far as he was concerned, the wedding feast would become a coarse carousal, the Gospel would be mere absolution, and Christian orthodoxy a cloak for sin. But the king's glance detected him even among the genuine

¹ 'Allusion is made to the Eastern custom observed at feasts, of distributing costly garments.'—Olshausen, iii. 176.

² Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 639.

³ Neander, *Life of Christ*, § 255, p. 409.

⁴ This trait in the parable would occasion no difficulty if there had been no trace of the custom to which we have alluded. The poorest person provides his own dress, if as a mark of favour he be invited to court.

guests. He asks him, ‘Friend, how comest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment?’ And he was speechless. The king commands the servants to bind him hand and foot, and to cast him into outer darkness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Thus the parable becomes once more a parable of judgment. The judgment is first of all to be regarded as an internal one. A greater self-delusion cannot exist, than when a man attempts to confound the experiences of grace, of which the essence is to eradicate sin, with the actings and thoughts of sin. This wicked course has for its consequence the most mischievous derangement of the life of the soul. But an outward judgment follows the inward. First of all a fearful repulsion arises between the pure spirit of the Church of Christ and the impure spirit of the hypocrites, and often the latter, when suddenly unveiled, retire as the most mischievous adversaries into outer darkness. But then the special punishment attends them: the servants bind their hands and feet. In their actions and course of conduct they are much more completely ruined than other reprobates. So deeply diseased and prostrated are they, that they have destroyed in themselves the capability of self-respect, and in the Church the possibility of believing in their return; and moreover, by the worst entanglement in the curse, they have utterly deprived themselves of the free movement of their life in the world. Here again the saying holds good, Many are called, but few chosen. Even in the body of professed believers in the righteousness by faith, individuals are to be found who are destitute of the fidelity of the chosen.

The chief contrast of this parable, as exhibited in the despisers and guests of the marriage feast, is shown on a small scale in the parable of the two sons whom their father wished to send into his vineyard (Matt. xxi. 28-31). The first answered to his father’s command to go and work in his vineyard, ‘I will not,’ but afterwards repented of his refusal and went. The other replied to the same injunction, ‘I go, sir,’ and went not. The Lord propounded this parable to the members of the Supreme Council at Jerusalem, who questioned His authority for purifying the temple, and called on them to decide which of the two sons did the will of their father. They answered, The first. Upon this they were obliged to listen to the denunciation, ‘Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you.’ The publicans and harlots had first of all renounced the service of God, the one by their position in life, the other by their sinful course. But the spirit of repentance which moved many of them in the time of Christ, was a proof that they repented of their inconsiderate haste. Many of these erring ones became labourers in the vineyard of the Lord. On the other hand, the heads of the Jewish people appeared, by their whole bearing, to be giving a constant assent to the call of God; while their conduct towards the Messiah was a constant decisive negative, which was consummated in the crucifixion. In this parable also, notwithstanding its definite immediate application, we cannot fail to perceive its general symbolical nature.

The high priests and elders might indeed have reminded the Lord that the people of Israel were God's true vineyard, and it cannot be disputed that they as official labourers continued to work in it. To this representation Christ assents : He causes them to appear in a new parable (Matt. xxi. 33-41 ; Mark xii. 1-9 ; Luke xx. 9-16) as labourers in the Lord's vineyard. Here therefore the vineyard is an image of the kingdom of God in its universal theocratic form,¹ while in the former parable He described the kingdom of New Testament life breaking out of the shell of Judaism.

The owner of the vineyard is God. He has completed the whole according to the ideal of a vineyard. The vines are planted ; a hedge surrounds the plantation ; and it is furnished with a wine-press and a watch-tower. The word of God, as the principle of consecrated life, forms the plantation ; the social communion, as the exclusion of those who are not members of the kingdom (under the Old Covenant represented by circumcision and the Passover, under the new by baptism and the Supper), forms the hedge ;² the wine-press denotes the holy suffering by which the spiritual wine is pressed from the grapes ; and the tower, the sacred discipline, the office of watching and punishing, in the Church. This vineyard the owner let out to vinedressers and went into a distant country. In the fruit-season he sent his servants to receive the rent. But these servants were ill-treated by them. According to Mark, one servant was sent first of all; whom they beat and sent empty away ; then another, whom they stoned and wounded in the head, and handled him shamefully ; last of all, one whom they killed outright.³ The owner then sent a greater number of servants, whom they maltreated in the same way. These vinedressers are manifestly the rulers of the Jewish nation, as far as they represent generally the prevailing tendency of the people in general. At their hands the Lord might expect to receive the proceeds of His capital, the genuine fruits of repentance. But they shamefully maltreated His prophets, and killed some of them. Christ makes two divisions of these messengers, in order that the sending of the son may appear more suitable as the third and last. The owner last of all sends his own (his only, his beloved) son to them, saying, They will reverence my son. He still wished to regard them not as rebels and robbers, but only as misguided men. But when the son came, they said, This is the heir ! This expression is highly significant. By employing it, Christ reproaches His enemies as well knowing that He came from the Father, and was filled with the life of God. The vinedressers were perfectly aware that to Him the vineyard really belonged, and on that account resolved to kill Him in order to get possession of His inheritance. 'And they took him and killed him,

¹ Compare Isa. v. 1-7.

² We cannot understand this hedge to mean the Mosaic law. Nor can we help noticing, that at the close of the parable the vineyard is transferred to other husbandmen. The kingdom of God passes into the New Testament form. But how is it possible to regard the Mosaic law as hedging in the New Testament kingdom?

³ According to Luke, they cast him out wounded.

and cast him out of the vineyard' (Mark xii. 8; Matt. xxi. 39). The meaning of these words strikes us at once. They were fulfilled to the letter. These Jews slew the Messiah before the vineyard. They put Him to death as an excommunicated person by the hands of the Gentiles. Jesus again caused the Jews to pass sentence on themselves. To the question, 'When the lord of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto these husbandmen?' they say to Him, 'He will miserably destroy these wicked men, and will let out his vineyard to other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons' (Matt. xxi. 40, 41).¹

Thus the judgment on the wicked administrators of the Old Testament theocracy is announced. But the same spirit of judgment which presides there, pervades also the New Testament theocracy, and executes also in it the decisions of eternal righteousness. But its judgments will come forth especially at the close of the New Testament economy. Then all false, unspiritual Christians will be rejected, while the faithful will enter into the kingdom of perfection. This is shown in the parable of the wise and foolish virgins (Matt. xxv. 1-13). But especially will all faithless overseers of the Christian Church experience a heavy sentence; this is taught by the parable of the wicked servant (Matt. xxiv. 45-51; Luke xii. 42-46).

There are times of darkness in the history of the kingdom of God, times which are full of severe temptation for believers. Such a time was that of Christ's crucifixion (Luke xxii. 53). The Lord has particularly illustrated the characteristics of a midnight of this kind by the parable of the ten virgins, which is constructed on the Jewish mode of celebrating weddings. The bridegroom went out at eventide in nuptial array, and with great pomp, to fetch his bride from her parents' house and bring her home to his father's. The bride watched for him, surrounded by the bridal virgins, who were provided with festive lamps, in which oil nourished the burning wick, and which were often carried on a wooden pole, so that they resembled equally torches and lamps. It was the office of these virgins to go out and meet the bridegroom on his approach, to congratulate him, and then to accompany him in a joyous procession with their lamps to his father's house, where the wedding was celebrated. On these occasions the bridegroom sometimes kept them waiting till late in the evening, and thus the bridal virgins were subjected to a trial. Their lamps might burn out if they were only scantily supplied with oil, so that they would suffer disgrace, especially if they fell asleep, and thus did not notice early enough the deficiency of oil in their lamps. The characteristic of this nocturnal trial, which the Lord has also exhibited in another para-

¹ Mark condenses the narrative, since he represents the Lord Himself as uttering this judgment. According to Luke, Christ's adversaries answered this address of the Lord by saying, God forbid! If the Pharisees, according to Matthew, passed this judgment themselves—on the supposition that they rightly understood the meaning of Jesus—this feigned impartiality certainly meant that it would be far from them to slay the true heir of God.

bolic discourse, consists in this: that the waiting virgins lost the festive disposition and earnest attention; that they did not continue in that watchful and joyous state of feeling which the occasion itself and the near approach of the bridegroom ought to have inspired. The significance of this danger is obvious. It is midnight for the Church of Christ when the diffusion of a worldly spirit has so gained the ascendancy as to produce the appearance as if the history of the Church were subject to the common course of the world and nature; as if the kingdom of heaven would not be completed at the judgment and the transformation of the world; as if Christ would not come again. Believers at such a time would be more than ever tempted to lose the feeling of being in the midst of the development of the wedding of the Christian reconciliation and purification of the world, and gradually to renounce their calling of contributing to the festivity of the work of their Lord. But more than once in the midnight of the progress of Christianity the cry is made, 'The Bridegroom cometh.' Heavy judgments and great awakenings testify the near approach of the Lord, and His spiritual advent expresses in continually stronger manifestations the approach of His glorified personality, as it takes place at an equal ratio with the transformation of the earth. But the members of the Church of Christ, through spiritual slothfulness, may sink into a state in which every great incident in Christ's approach will become a heavy judgment. Such a judgment is exhibited to us in the fate of the foolish virgins. The ten virgins, taken all together, do not form merely some part of the Church, as Olshausen thinks, but the whole Church, as indeed is indicated by the number ten. But they signify the Church in one peculiar relation, namely, as it ought to exhibit the glory of the bride with her abundant splendour; the Church, therefore, in its destiny, as full of spiritual joy and blessedness, waiting with the full brightness of her Lord's inner life, to maintain His honour in His absence, and to meet Him triumphantly at His advent. The sleeping in this parable is indeed a questionable thing; but it is not the special point of criminality, otherwise the wise virgins would not be represented as sleeping at the same time as the foolish ones. It is distinctly said of all of them, 'While the bridegroom tarried they all slumbered and slept.' For a while they lost the consciousness of the importance of their position, and of the commencement of the wedding. But this situation was critical, especially since they could not notice whether the oil in their lamps was too quickly consumed. The point of importance in this parable is the oil, the spirit of the inner life.¹ The foolish virgins awaken, as well as the wise, at the cry raised by the most wakeful spirits in the Church, 'The Bridegroom

¹ De Weite remarks on the passage: 'The oil which they have in store is not (according to a current devotional interpretation) precisely the Holy Spirit, possibly because *anointing* is, in Scripture language, equivalent to being under the Spirit's influence (*Inspiration*). It denotes the internal persistency in watchfulness, and, so far, internal spiritual power.' This remark depends on the distinction between the anointing of the Spirit, and the internal spiritual power in the Christian life.

cometh !' They also are provided with lamps, and begin, like the others, to trim them, that they may burn clear. But now it is found that oil is wanting to their lamps; they are gone out. The wise, on the contrary, are provided with a sufficiency of oil; and in this consists the essential difference. The parable therefore exhibits the contrast between the unspiritual, dead members of the Christian Church, and those who are spiritually alive. This difference exists at all times. But it always becomes more important as time advances, and at last appears in all its fearfulness, and is the basis of an essential decision and separation in the judgment which awaits the Church. All the members will wish, at last, to take a part in the imperial glory of the Church. They all have lamps—the forms of faith, the confession of the Church, and their outward position in it. But then the question will be, whether this form speaks the truth, or deceives; whether it is filled by the eternal contents of the Spirit of Christ or not. The foolish virgins have not the Spirit of Christ; they want the burning lamps, the proofs of love and the songs of praise. But it belongs to the more allegorical finish of the parable, when the foolish virgins say to the wise, ' Give us of your oil, for our lamps are gone out ;' and when these answer, ' Not so; lest there be not enough for us and you; but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves.' On the one hand, the earnest longing after the communication of the Spirit is the first beginning of the spiritual life itself; and on the other, the spiritual fulness of one Christian cannot be diminished by impartation to another. Nevertheless, this representation has also symbolical features. The feeling of a deficiency is now awakened in the foolish virgins, and yet they wish to retard the completion of the wise. But these must now attend to their calling, to begin the festive life of the kingdom in the communion of their Lord. The separation is come to maturity. Still a prospect seems to open to them of reaching their destination, since the advice is given them, ' Go to them that sell, and buy for yourselves ;' since the wise ones counselled them to seek for the spiritual life in the regular way of Christian meditation and of Christian endeavour; in the faithful employment of the instituted means of grace. But while the foolish virgins went to buy, the bridegroom comes. The wise virgins become partakers of the feast, and the door of the festive hall is closed. At last the foolish virgins come and cry out at the door, ' Lord, Lord, open to us !' They receive the answer, ' Verily I say unto you, I know you not !' This is manifestly a judicial sentence. Olshausen maintains, that from the connection it results that the sentence, ' I know you not,' cannot mark eternal condemnation. ' Rather,' he says, ' the foolish virgins were only excluded from the marriage supper of the Lamb' (Rev. xix. 7). But it is very uncertain, when Olshausen says, ' These virgins had the universal condition of salvation, faith (from their calling *κύριε, κύριε, ἀνοιξον ἡμῖν*, ver. 11), but they wanted the requisite for the kingdom of God which proceeds from faith, sanctification (Heb.

xii. 14).' The objective fact which he has here in his eye is the difference between the first and second resurrection—between the preliminary judgment of the world, which is to be succeeded by the glorification of the Church of Christ on earth, and the last judgment, which will be followed by its transformation into a heavenly state of existence. But this constitutes no reason for seeing in the parable only the preliminary judgment. That the foolish virgins said, 'Lord ! Lord !' and craved an entrance to the feast, did not qualify them as believers. Had they been believers, they would also have been welcome guests. Even the rejected at the last judgment will excuse themselves, according to Matt. xxv. Yet it is not to be lost sight of, that there is a difference between the description of the judgment as it affects the foolish virgins, and as it affects the finally rejected. Therefore, although no particular preliminary judgment is here spoken of, yet the thought of a transient judgment seems to predominate. According to the whole structure of the parable, we may venture to see in it all the preliminary judgments of the Lord, even to the last judgment. And such is the actual fact. As often as the Lord comes to His Church in a new manifestation of His Spirit, a separation is made between the dead and the living members of the Church. Only the children of the Spirit form a joyous procession with Him to His marriage supper. This was the case for the first time, when at Pentecost the Lord returned to His Church by His Spirit. The wise in Israel went in with Him to His feast ; the foolish remained without. This will one day be signally verified when the palmiest times of the Church begin, her true glorification in the world. The unspiritual, perfectly dead part of Christendom then set themselves, in some form or other, in marked opposition to the glorified Church. The final judgment was not yet passed upon them ; but it is not said that they would necessarily be restored in that judgment. That will depend upon how the last judgment will find them.

As to what relates to this judgment which will come on the Church, the Lord finally has expressed in the most striking manner the climax of evil in the Church, by the parable, already mentioned, of the wicked servant. It is remarkable, that it was Peter who gave the Lord occasion to deliver it. The Lord exhorts the disciples to watch (Luke xii. 35, 36) like servants who wait for their lord when he returns from the wedding. They are to have their loins girt and their lamps burning. They must wait in earnest expectation of their coming Lord, and not incur His displeasure by self-indulgence, and by allowing, like dark spirits, their lights to become dim and go out. Christ closed this exhortation with the words, 'If he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants' (ver. 38). But then this cheerful earnest image is changed into a threatening one : 'And this know, that if the good-man of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through.'

Be ye therefore ready also : for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not.' The thief easily deceives the householder in the night, if he does not know at what hour he will come. If he only knew this, nothing would be easier than to hinder the thief. Therefore the uncertainty of the hour of the coming of Jesus Christ is the great danger which always threatens the careless among His disciples ; and the more they surrender themselves to their carelessness, so much the more dangerous and obnoxious to them will be the coming of Jesus Christ, as to a householder the breaking in of a thief.¹ This parabolic representation contains two most important thoughts. The Christian must indeed consider, that the very next moment may put him in a fearfully difficult position, which will urge him to a decision for his life, and become a judgment for him, if he has not carefully watched beforehand, so as to understand the meaning of this hour when it comes. Christ's language, which He so often repeats, respecting the uncertainty of that hour, shows us most clearly how distinctly the certainty was present to His mind, that after the tardy course of the periodic time of the Church's æon, the final catastrophe which is to introduce a new epoch will come with fearful and startling rapidity. Peter having asked the Lord whether He had uttered this parable in reference to them, the disciples alone, or to all, the parable we have mentioned follows (Luke xii. 41-48). It appears at first not in parabolic compactness, but in a discourse which gradually assumes a distinctly parabolic form. The Lord said, 'Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season?' This question distinguishes in their spiritual importance between the class of spiritual stewards and those whom they provide for in the Church. But who is the servant? The decision is difficult, but it is given in the following words : 'Blessed is that servant whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing.' Whoever, therefore, at His coming is occupied in dispensing spiritual food to the household, as it becomes him, the doctrines, the consolations, and the encouragements of the Gospel, him his Lord will mark as the servant originally called by Him, and will attest him to be such by placing him over all His goods, and thus making him a prince in the kingdom of the Spirit. But if that servant, who in his real character was distinctly present to his mind as evil ('*that evil servant*', Matt. xxiv. 48), should say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming, and should begin to beat the men-servants and maidens, the younger members of the household, and to eat and drink, and give himself up to inebriety, and therefore changing his calling to furnish food to his fellow-servants into the stand-point of a despotic judicial taskmaster in the house, the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will pass upon him the sentence of theocratic zeal ; he will cut him in sunder,² and will appoint him his portion

¹ See Olshausen's *Commentary*, ii. 307.

² Compare 1 Sam. xv. 33.

with the unbelievers, or with the hypocrites. And thus will he make it evident that he was not his true and accredited servant; for in the kingdom of Christ, according to its essential spirituality, the office must coincide with the interior life and the conduct. The general rule by which the Lord inflicts those severe punishments is next given. The servant who knew his lord's will and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, will suffer many stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall suffer few stripes. For every man has an immediate feeling of the will of his heavenly Lord, which he ought to cultivate; and as punishment is due even when a servant does not know what his lord wills, so in a like sense is a man punishable when he does not know what God wills.¹ But the punishment of the servant who wilfully transgresses his Lord's will, will be great. By this rule a greater punishment will be inflicted on a bad Christian than on a bad heathen, and a greater still on a bad clergyman; and so the scale rises up to a bad bishop, and that servant who holds the highest position in the Church with the greatest unfaithfulness, will on that account be punished most severely. The punishment of being '*cut in sunder*', expresses the fearful contrast which is formed between the greatest, most careless, judicial arrogance, and the sudden endurance of the most horrible doom. Such a doom falls everywhere on the clerical office, where it falls asunder by a schism into dead parts, where by divisions it loses its authority and power. But as to what concerns the despotic functionary in the Church of Christ, his punishment is more precisely determined in Luke: 'his portion is appointed with unbelievers.' He was an unbeliever who made himself a lord of the Church, because he did not thoroughly believe with his heart in the return of his Lord, and therefore neglected and ill-treated his fellow-servants, and gave himself up to a life of self-indulgence. But, according to Matthew, he receives the punishment of the hypocrites, since in his unbelief he assumed the credit of the greatest and most ardent zeal, while he maltreated his fellow-servants. The punishment of the 'evil servant' is therefore this, that he is cast into the abode of the lost, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

The two last parables distinctly point to the great representation of the last judgment, which Jesus has given, not in a parable, but in a discourse pervaded by parabolic traits (Matt. xxv. 31–46). We have seen how the parables relating to the kingdom of God rise in one straight stem, and then branch out into parables of mercy and of judgment. Last of all, the lofty summit of this parabolic system appears in the parabolic representation already mentioned of the last judgment. And here, in the crown of the system, we see the blossom of the parable fully expand, and the resplendent flower break forth of a clear representation of the appearance of the kingdom of God in its New Testament glory; while, by the abundance of its symbolical traits, it shows that it forms the crown of the

¹ Compare Olshausen, iii. 1.

parabolic system. Nor will the circumstance that this representation is destitute of the compact parabolic form, prevent us from considering it, since it forms the natural organic head of the cycle of parables ; in fact, it is the key by which Christ teaches us to unfold what is hidden and veiled in all the parables of the kingdom.

We see here how mercy is to form the decisive rule by which the Lord will pass sentence, and consummate His kingdom. The Son of man appears in His glory, and all His angels with Him, and He sits on the throne of His glory. Thus is the revelation of Christ's consummated kingdom of glory depicted. All nations are assembled before Him.¹ All men come under the judgment of the Christian rule of life ; and as a shepherd divides the sheep from the goats, so Christ divides men. He places the sheep on His right, and the goats on His left. Therefore on that day the human race is so matured in the works of separating contrast, that it needs only the coming forth of Christ, only a signal from Him, to complete the separation which had matured in life. Now the merciful are saluted by Christ as the blessed of His Father. In His judgment they have brought the required aid to Him in all His sufferings : they have fed the hungry, given drink to the thirsty, taken in the stranger, clothed the naked, visited the sick, sought out the prisoner. But these merciful ones are also the humble ; they cannot recollect that they have acted as such angels of mercy on earth. And these humble ones are also the truly Christ-like. For what they have done to the least among them whom Christ calls His brethren, they have done, in His judgment, to Himself. They had, therefore, in their eye not merely the physical in the sufferers, with an unspiritual sensuous sympathy ; but they cherished and raised the inner man in them, their Christian destiny and christological dignity. The noble marks of the divine lineage in the unfortunate have attracted and moved them as a life related to their own, and by their charity they have brought them nearer to Christ. 'Inherit the kingdom,' Christ says, announcing their reward, 'prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' They enter into eternal life as the blessed of the Father, as those who were pervaded by the blessing of the Father. The kingdom of a chosen humanity perfected in the Spirit of Christ, in humility and love, and raised above death, has been founded in them from the beginning, and its completion will be carried on among them in the development of the world, and above them in the administration of the Father. Now this inheritance exists in its bloom, and receives them as the phenomenal world, corresponding to its inner nature. But the wicked will be rejected as the unmerciful, who, in all the relations of misery, have no heart for the destitute. But they reveal themselves, moreover, as the self-righteous, since they are not disposed to

¹ Olshausen, without reason, would find in this representation only the delineation of a final judgment on unbelievers. Unbelievers, as such, would indeed not be yet ripe for judgment. Besides, this judgment is too decidedly represented as a judgment on all nations.

convict themselves of negligence in the duty of mercy. But lastly, it contributes to their severest reproach, that they entirely ignored the golden threads of the christological relation which go through all human life, that they have not regarded in man the calling to Christ, and therefore not Christ in humanity. Christ sends them away from Himself as accursed. The word here is no mere term of reproach, but the description of a reality. They are pervaded by the curse as a petrifaction by the stony material (*κατηραμένοι*). Therefore they will be thrown into the æonian fire, prepared for the devil and his angels; and they will be sent into the æonian punishment. The æonian fire began from the fall of Satan to develop itself in him and in his associates; and in this development a great spiritual torment, a great community of destruction, ripened in humanity. This must separate itself under the sentence of the Lord in the last crisis of the Christian world, as a tormenting fire-æon, from the blessed light-æon of perfected humanity. The Christian development of the world, according to its whole epic course, cannot pass over into a heavenly nature in an idyllic continuity, but must close with a catastrophe—must complete itself in a fiery paroxysm of world-historic magnitude. As in a man with a mortal disease, the departing life at last breaks loose from the stiffening body in a fiery conflict, so at last the world of light will separate itself from the world of the curse—the kingdom of the new humanity perfected in love from the æon of fierce discord, and of an old humanity devouring itself in the doom of *egoism*, which falls back into the pre-human spirit-regions of the demons. This will take place when the kingdom of Christ in this world has, in its last development, most nearly approached to the kingdom of Christ in the other world, and when, in consequence of reciprocal attraction, this world passes over into the other, and the other into this, so that the barrier falls, and Christ appears in the midst of His people *here*, or His people appear before His glorious throne *there*; both in one and the same event.

The cycle of the parables of judgment forms also a succession of world-historical pictures, in which retributive justice exhibits the successive great acts of its administration. The parables of the labourers in the vineyard, each of whom receives a penny, of the pounds, and of the talents, reveal the administration of rewarding retribution, and at the same time show how punitive retribution accompanies it as its complement. The first world-picture shows us the action of the energy of the Spirit in the founding of the kingdom of God. The divine justice appears in its unity with grace, since it is altogether spirit; therefore it does not miss its reward, according to the external mode of valuing human work. Human conversion corresponds to it in its spirituality; it raises itself above the loss of time, and can receive and experience from God the blotting out of the guilt of this loss. The second world-picture shows us how the external might of the offices of the kingdom appointed by God gains the world. The nobleman in his appearance is poor,

and his servants are poor ; but he gains the whole kingdom and puts down the rebellion ; while they gain for him the single component parts of his kingdom, according to the measure of the internal energy of the life of their calling. The third world-picture shows us how recompensing justice gives every servant of God a spiritual gain in the kingdom of God, and how it corresponds exactly to the faithful application of His spiritual gifts. But we see punitive justice by the side of the remunerative acting in a threefold manner : the servants of a mercenary, outwardly calculated mechanical service were punished by the disappointment of their outward expectation ; the servants of spiritual sloth, by being deprived of their gifts ; and the actual rebels against the government of a prince who is identical with grace, by the severe punishments which their own unmercifulness demanded. Then the scenes of judicial justice, in its predominant agency, are announced by the phenomena of its menaces and warnings. We see Death as the messenger of Judgment stalking through the world, and hear in all the paths of mortality the footsteps of the approaching retribution. A whole world of manifestations of divine grace is further shown us in the history of the respite fig-tree, as a numerous group of revelations of long-suffering, in which already the most alarming omens of judgment are disclosed. Then follow the images of the judgment itself. We see how first of all judgment strikes man in general when he despises the invitation of God to the spiritual feast of the divine life in His kingdom, and likewise when he would profane this spiritual feast, and change it into the common carousal of a sinful life. These crimes of despising and desecrating the Eternal appear in an aggravated form as crimes of dishonesty. The unchristian changes into the antichristian, and calls forth a judgment of the rejection of whole communities, as is represented in the parable of the criminal vinedressers. These special acts of penal justice point to the general judgment as they come forth more distinctly at the end of time. Judgment begins first of all at the house of God. We see in the parable of the foolish virgins, how the dead part of the theocracy, as well as of the Christian Church, is shut out from the festive communion of living believers ; and in the parable of the wicked servant, how the hardened individuals among the overseers of the Church must suffer the heaviest retribution. Out of this judgment of the Lord on the Church the judgment on all nations finally unfolds itself. But as rewarding justice is always complemented by punitive justice, so this again is also accompanied by the former, which is constantly unfolding the divine affluence of its grace. For God changes not towards man, but man changes towards Him ; and in this change a separation according to their opposite tendencies is produced, which is constantly widening, till at last a separation which reaches to the bottomless pit is consummated in the last judgment. Hence the completed condemnation of the ungodly is the completed redemption of the godly. The separation of the æon of light and the æon of the curse in the last

crisis of the history of humanity, forms therefore the completion of the Christian kingdom of God.

In this manner Christ has delivered to His people the doctrine of the founding of the kingdom of God, in parables which form themselves into a system with wonderful fulness and distinctness.

The very name of this institution characterizes its nature. It is the kingdom of God¹ in opposition to the kingdom of this world—the completed theocracy. While the ancient theocracy exhibited itself in the individual inspired flashes of the prophets, and thus its peculiar function consisted in momentary flowings forth of eternity into time, this kingdom of God is a firmly established kingdom of human spirits, in which God Himself rules as King, and His Spirit as the supreme law of life, and the union of human hearts with God in His royal supreme will is its peculiar life-element. This kingdom is also, according to its nature, equally the kingdom of heaven;² an ideal state, or a state of ideality, of the purest distinctness and action of all relations in the unity of a heavenly, consecrated life. That which makes heaven to be heaven is the perfect elevation of all its phenomena into its idea, or its ideality. But its idea is its consecration to God. In that, therefore, consists the holiness of heaven, that it rises into this divine consecration. The kingdom of heaven is consequently an institution pure and consecrated as heaven itself. Hence the Lord can recognize the kingdom of heaven in no state of inferior purity. But this institution is also termed ‘*the kingdom*’ simply (Matt. xiii. 19, &c.), because in it the perfected human society, the eternal organism, is realized in the essential relations of humanity. This organism culminates, and has its point of unity, in a head animating all the members, that is, in Christ, and hence this kingdom is also called the kingdom of Christ (Matt. xiii. 41; John xviii. 36, &c.) But since this kingdom has been prepared by the theocratic plan of the entire world-history, and since, according to this great historical development, it has appeared first of all in a prefigurative form in the Old Testament consecrated kingdom, it has been also named after that typical kingdom in its greatest splendour, and thus is called the kingdom of David (Mark xi. 10). The head of this kingdom is also its principle. Its first, unrecognized appearance in the world is the person of Christ Himself. This kingdom flourishes in His heart, in His Spirit, and begins to unfold itself in His works. The King of truth is the soul of the kingdom of truth; therefore on His appearance the proclamation is made, ‘The kingdom of heaven is at hand! ’

But the historic goal of this kingdom is the completion of the Christian aeon, the appearance of the glory of Christ in the perfected manifestation of the glory of His Church, and the glorification of the Church by the appearance of the Lord. The leading outlines of that completion of the ancient aeon, upon which the new aeon of the kingdom makes its appearance, are the following:—The life of Christ, as the vital principle of humanity, has completed its re-

¹ Η βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Mark i. 15, &c. ² Η βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. Matt. xiii, &c.

generation. The palingenesia is effected in the core of humanity to such a degree that a new humanity exhibits itself in perfect beauty as a splendid organism which shines forth in eternity, and from which the image of God is reflected (Matt. xix. 28). The earth itself is drawn upwards in this palingenesia. Its ethereal light-image has become complete with the new humanity, and issues forth as a heavenly star from the cloud of its humiliation (Matt. v. 14; Luke xii. 49).¹ The appearance of Christ is accomplished in this way, that the interval between this world and the next is removed by the completed victory of the Christian spirit (Matt. xxiv. 14).

The kingdom of God, therefore, is in constant development between these two points of its life—between its principle, the invisible life of Christ, resting in the depths of heaven and of humanity, and between that glorious appearance of the transformed human world resting in the depths of the future. The question now presents itself, by what means is the life of Christ changed into the life of humanity?

The first means by which the life of Christ becomes the life of the world, is the word of Christ, the Gospel (Matt. xiii. 3, 19). It is secured to the world by a perpetual ordinance of Christ in the evangelical office of teaching.² But the teaching of Christ is from the first quite identical with His life, and therefore His life exhibits itself in a second means, in His collective heavenly doings (John ii. 18). But His course of conduct and His works are secured to His Church by the calling of His witnesses (Acts i. 8). But Christ's doings are completed only in His sufferings and death. His death is the redemption of the world (Matt. xxvi. 28). And His death is continually incorporated with the world by the confession of His people (Matt. xvi. 24, 25). And as Christ has completed His work in His own eternal Spirit, so also it can be completed in the hearts of His people only by the same Spirit (John xvi. 7). With His Spirit, His life and sufferings first become a peculiar possession of His people in their unity, power, and depth, as a full divine work, and by the life of His Spirit they become His Church. By His Church, then, the life of Christ is transplanted into the world (John xvii. 18). But how is His Church to be recognized? In this way, that they exhibit His life in their life (John xiii. 35); that they miss His visible presence with consciousness and earnest longing, and hope with firm confidence for His return (John xiv. 27, 28); and that, in the certainty of His spiritual presence, they express this intermediate state by celebrating the communion according to His institution—the present and future communion by the rite of holy baptism, the past communion by partaking of the holy supper (Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xxii. 19). In the holy sacraments the Church comprehends all the means, as given by the Lord, by which the kingdom of God in it and by it is established in the world—the word, the doing, and the suffering of Christ, His Spirit and His future appearance. In the moments of true com-

¹ Christ kindles the earth itself with His fire.

² John xx. 21.

munion the Church for an instant enters into that appearance, it shines in an anticipated lustre of the kingdom (Mark xiv. 24, 25; Luke xxii. 29, 30).

By the continual use of these means the Church is constantly advancing towards its manifestation, urged on by the power of Christ's life; and this movement is healthful in proportion as the means co-operate in living unity, and as it is carried on with a reference to both points. Consequently, the progress of the Christian palingenesia is always arrested where the sacraments are administered, without the living word, or where the word is proclaimed without the exhibition of its power of manifestation in the sacraments, or where the word and the sacraments are administered disconnectedly, because the spirit that unites the two elements is not sought by prayer. But if, on the one hand, the manifestation of the kingdom of Christ is prematurely exhibited in a State where the ecclesiastical power is supreme, this is a too active manifestation, that goes beyond the truth and loses itself in illusions, in which the vital principle of the palingenesia must more and more be lost. And if, on the other hand, the word of Christ should be made a mere scholastic term, so that the sense of the need of communion, to say nothing of longing after the manifestation of Christ and His glory in humanity, is continually diminishing,—this is a spiritualism which cannot be recognized as the spiritual life of the Word made flesh, and is not capable in the least of effecting the regeneration of the world.

Therefore, where there is no well-developed Christian communion, no guarantee can exist that the Christian life will be active in its vital principle; and where the communion goes beyond its destination, and is changed into a State organism, it is a sure sign that it operates no longer deeply and with perfect fidelity as the spirit of regeneration. The communion in its ideal form is therefore the constant living medium between the throne of the invisible Christ and His future appearing. And thus through Christian fellowship His life mingles itself in its separate elements with the life of the world. His word is the law of the kingdom and of life to it. Were it governed by an inferior law, it would not be the communion of Christ. But it makes His word not immediately the political life-law of the world. If it attempted this, it would change Christ into a Moses, and Christianity into Judaism, instead of being the medium of imparting His life to the world. But it feels that the latter object is its vocation, and proves it, since by ingrafting Christ's words on the morals and laws of the world, it constantly keeps in view its final aim that the world may become the kingdom of Christ. And in the same way it imparts the mysteries of its doctrine, as well as its whole life. If it were to subtract anything from the original fulness of Christianity, it would damage the institution which it was appointed to maintain, and evermore adulterate it with the heathenism of the natural worldly mind. If, on the other hand, it were disposed to make this institution predominant in the world at the cost of human freedom, it would change Christianity into Judaism.

Rightly to bring the institution of Christ into harmony with the freedom of the human mind and conscience, is a task infinitely difficult, and yet blessed in itself and in its consequences.

It results from the magnitude of this task that the kingdom of God can only by slow degrees attain the maturity of its manifestation in the world, and that the exact time of its future cannot be computed (Mark xiii. 32). Further, it results from its free spiritual character, that the kingdom of God cannot be exhibited prematurely in heavenly purity (Matt. xiii. 30), but that, nevertheless, its sanctification must be aspired after, according to the measure of its vital principle, its spirit, and its aim.

Hence the firm planting of the kingdom of God is effected by a continual movement, which, on the one hand, always exhibits the entire fulness of the divine mercy, in the reception of all who stand in need of salvation (Matt. xviii. 21-35), and on the other hand, the entire severity of the divine judgment, in the constant exclusion of all by the ecclesiastical discipline, who would bring scandals into the Church. On the other hand, this movement has not its full energy, or rather it is depressed by hindrances in the same proportion as admission is effected with carnal rigour or facility ; or as the exclusion with similar carnality, is carried to the length of political persecution, or is neglected to the loss of the social sense of honour in the members of the Church.

But all defects in the progress of the Church, between the manifestation of mercy and of judgment, will be corrected and rendered complete by the great administration of mercy and of justice by the Lord over the Church. They will be rectified : the Lord receives the merciful Samaritan in a thousand forms into the communion of His people, and ejects the guest without the wedding garment, as well as the evil servant, with a fearful doom from the communion. They will be rendered complete : the Church itself, like the world, is an object of the completed judgments and mercies of the Lord ; and in a mysterious reciprocal action between the formation of the Church for the world, and the world for the Church, the time advances, when with mighty throes the epoch of the final decision suddenly comes. On the one hand, mercy celebrates its manifestation in the living images which are filled by it, and become its perfected organ, its everlasting feast in the kingdom of love. Then, on the other hand, justice celebrates its glorification, since the condemned exhibit its administration, and must justify it in their own persons in the kingdom of inflexible wrath and vengeance. But justice and mercy are never separated, although their æons, when completed, separate from one another in humanity. Justice reveals itself to the Church of the saved in the holiness of love. But the multitude of the reprobate is involved in the darkness of a corresponding æon, by a compassion which has veiled itself in punitive justice. But the kingdom of God is then completed, when in this manner Christ has communicated His blessedness to the new humanity. The Church is united to Him as His bride. It is therefore

wholly participant of His life, and enters into the inheritance of His glory. And if a region is situated opposite this Church, in which the despising of His life is punished by an æonian spiritual agony, it is shown by this how men are struck in its depths by His rays, and shaken to bow the knee in His name, and in the relation of their life to Him to occupy the right position in the kingdom of spirits (Phil. ii. 10, 11).

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.



BS2420 .L275 1872 v.1
The life of the Lord Jesus Christ: a

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00030 1319